COHDMAP
Cohesion Mapping of Community Dynamics

Final Report

Prof. Mark R D Johnson (Editor)
Availability of Data for Monitoring Community Cohesion

Report of the Scoping Study

Mark R D Johnson, Thilo Boeck, Alison Skinner, Jenny Fleming and Colleagues, (Mary Seacole Research Centre / Centre for Social Action; De Montfort University) with Anil Gumber (CEEHD) and David Owen (CRER), University of Warwick for the Institute of Community Cohesion
Contents

1. Summary 4

2. Introductory Review 7

3. Identifiable Communities and Groups 10

4. Agencies and associated Data Sources 20

5. Current Practice 35

6. Conclusions and Recommendations 39

References & Sources 45

Appendix 1:
Background review: Literature on Race/Ethnicity, Segregation and Monitoring 50

Appendix 2:
Selected pages from Internet Data Observatories 54
1. Summary

The following Report is based on a scoping review of published and public documents, supplemented by responses to a survey sent to all local authority bodies conducted in conjunction with IDeA, and some further responses to more direct enquiries to data-gathering agencies. The main sources have been reviews of published reports including so-called ‘grey literature’ (i.e. not peer-reviewed academic articles), visits to (or telephone interviews with) selected local authorities and other similar agencies, internet searching, and discussion with selected experts.

We have sought to take account of changes in national government departmental responsibilities, and note that the continuing debates regarding immigration control and community cohesion, including the work of the recently created Commission for Integration and Cohesion under the leadership of Darra Singh will create even more impetus behind this work.

We are pleased to note that the new Department for Communities and Local Government has taken over the former Home Office responsibilities for promoting ‘cohesive communities’ and is continuing to adopt the following definition:

- There is a common vision and sense of belonging
- The diversity of people’s backgrounds … is appreciated and valued
- Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities, and
- Strong and positive relationships are being developed

(Kitchen et al 2006).

The importance of collecting and collating data on the origins, demography and cultural characteristics of local populations was underlined by the original generation of ‘Community Cohesion’ indicators by the Home Office in 2003, and the agreement of participants in the ‘action learning programme’ that:

all local agencies need a detailed understanding of the nature of the communities they serve to enable them to assess how equipped they are in building community cohesion. An up-to-date assessment of the local context will enable improved delivery of services and the monitoring of trends. Local authorities will benefit greatly by mapping and sharing information about issues such as ethnicity, age, culture and faith by area and by social and economic characteristics (Home Office 2004 –Community Cohesion Pathfinder Programme).

Nevertheless, participants also agreed that this could be problematic – and that particular problems arose in defining and choosing indicators, in collecting information efficiently and economically when resources are limited, and in involving a variety of agencies in data collection and data sharing.

From our review, it is clear that there is a strong consensus on the potential value of a mechanism to ensure better use of data, such as a common template and guidance on data-use and, perhaps, a repository of information on population change and the demographic components of such change, in order to anticipate needs and promote community cohesion.

We were frequently told that these data ‘ought’ to exist, or that they were being collected
but inadequately used. Many commentators noted that some local authorities at least were attempting to make estimates of local populations groups and changes, based on local accumulation of qualitative knowledge supplemented by hints from routine statistical datasets. While overall there is strong support for the concept and value of monitoring demographic population turnover there is little consistency in understanding of the relevant issues, categories, or even in some cases, concepts involved. More problematic has been the fact that many of the key data-collecting agencies or data-collection exercises are being reviewed, alongside constant reorganisation of the relevant bodies, and sometimes confusion or change in the responsibility for such data. There are also different spatial units utilised in such data collection, from enumeration district to Governmental regional office areas, or a diversity of Census ‘output areas’.

It has becoming increasingly apparent that there is no single source or any regular ‘monitoring’ beyond that represented in the decennial census, that really meets the needs identified. The (in)frequency of the Census, (and the inevitable delays in its processing) means that the data from that source is inevitably inadequate for our purpose. Other datasets suffer from similar problems of immediacy (lack of) and frequency of updating. Home Office ‘Section 95’ data have great value but are at present under review: similarly, the NHS proposed electronic patient record system has enormous potential, provided that its ‘secondary uses service’ can overcome problems of data security and the technical issues involved in setting up the world’s largest database. Certain national datasets are not available or are carefully guarded (in the sense of the NHS ‘Caldicott Guardians’), for good reason, and there are certain issues around data protection and governance to be considered. A relatively recent dataset, the PLASC, has great potential and could be more widely used as an estimator of population change. However, while its data are only really applicable to families with children, it may still provide an indicator or proxy estimate for whole populations, and its use is still being developed.

Most other datasets are not collected at a local level in any consistent way. Major national surveys, based on local data, have some potential (provided that one is content with sub-regional rather than local areas) but these do not consistently record details of ‘ethnicity’ or nationality in the sorts of detail that would be required for the identification of ‘new migrant’ groups: the ONS Census ’16 category breakdown is adequate (with the added questions on religion, and possibly language, used in some places) to identify UK established minority ethnic groups and their needs. No agency, at all level, appears to be collecting data which identifies ‘refugee/asylum seeker’ status although the NASS is moving to a new system of case management which may be more useful if access is allowed.

There are other datasets which may have some value or potential, although at present it is not clear that they are collected routinely, systematically or over a large enough area in a consistent fashion, and for some, ownership and accessibility is uncertain. One possible future source of data might be uptake of language-support services, for example, although at present only police and criminal justice services use registered providers in a consistent fashion: there are however some consortia or local service agreements and providers who might provide such data. We have attempted to identify other similar possible sources of monitoring data which might meet needs.

We must also acknowledge the real concerns expressed by both officers and practitioners, (and the public at large) about data safety which must be taken into account. It is
understood that the development of the NHS ‘electronic patient record’ has been delayed partly by GP and hospital doctors’ concerns about data protection, and alarm has been raised by a report from the Information Commissioners Office (‘What price privacy’) on the easy availability of personal data via commercial channels. While it has been noted in an article in The Guardian on information sharing, ‘joined-up-government’ and privacy, that “Linking databases could yield the mobility data for measuring cohesion - credit card records, mobile phone records linked with government data such as the DWP Longitudinal Study - which links benefit and tax records for postcoded individuals!” (see Mathieson 2006), it is clear that such actions would need to be carefully marketed to achieve community approval. Our research to date has not found an overwhelming argument for linking personal (individual) data, and it seems that most of the desirable outcomes could be achieved by better use of anonymised routine monitoring data, using better collection. analysis and collation of variables on language, religion, culture, ethnicity/ethnic group and citizenship status, as appropriate.

We believe that a considerable amount of progress can now be achieved by providing Local Authorities and their partners with a form of template which they can use to bring together sources of information (of all types) and routine statistical data in a way which would give guidance to population change and tensions in their area - as well as pointing to ways in which this data collection might need to be improved. This could rely, to a considerable extent, upon the data sources identified in this report. It would be helpful to also provide some form of training and technical expertise (or opportunities to exchange experience in learning sets) and it is possible that some sort of centralised support unit might also be helpful, without necessarily creating a new national observatory body. Our report therefore concentrates on describing potential sources of information and their present usefulness and potential value if modified and developed, and we propose that any future development should begin by considering how this might be built into a toolkit or model framework, and examining the precise content and quality of each item or source of data as the next phase of the work.
2. Introductory Review

There has been a longstanding interest in examining the demographic composition of local areas, and especially in the ‘ethnic mix’ of neighbourhoods. Initially, this was driven by concerns relating to ‘race’ and racialised tensions, and also by the need to provide local services to people whose language and culture was different from that of the majority. There is some disagreement among experts and politicians about the desirable levels of diversity and mixing, although it is generally agreed that the formation of ‘ghettoised’ areas of (near)-single ethnic homogeneity is undesirable, and even where the sole group consists of the autochthonous (and heterogeneous) ‘White British’ population, concerns have been raised. Recent urban policy in the Netherlands has considered the value of engineering social mixing, but encountered problems in bringing together “the so-called native Dutch, immigrants and ‘newcomers’, who face problems in living together and sharing public spaces” (Smets 2006:293). Academic and policy research has so far failed to establish if there is an optimum level of diversity or a reliable indicator of this which could be linked to predictions of community cohesion (see Appendix 1).

However, as a recent report from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister demonstrates, the level of physical ‘mixing’ of population groups remains the easiest way to provide an estimate of the level of social integration and community cohesion, stating that “There has been an improvement in social cohesion across the country. The vast majority of cities have become more integrated during the past decade…” (ODPM 2005). That said, the HO/DCLG Citizenship Survey (Kitchen et al 2006:9) shows clearly that while ‘people who lived in areas with the highest concentration of minority ethnic population were less likely to have positive views of their neighbourhood on some measures’, four out of five in such mixed areas said that ‘people from different backgrounds got on well together’ (italics added).

Community Cohesion

The term ‘Community Cohesion’ has gained considerable currency in policy circles following the urban disturbances in the early years of the 21st century. It is generally seen as covering similar issues as ‘race and community relations’, but does recognise that other social tensions and cleavages, such as those based on faith, age and travelling communities, as well as the presence of migrant workers and asylum seekers (or refugees) which have begun to occupy a higher profile in public debate. Further, other aspects of social exclusion and disadvantage are involved, and there may be a complex relationship between the demographic makeup of an area and political or social unrest or expression. According to the Citizenship Survey, there is no relationship between the proportion of ethnic minority households in an area and views on community cohesiveness (Kitchen et al 2006:18). However, we have accepted that one of the determinants of community solidarity does appear to be the composition and turnover of the local community, and have tended to concentrate on the identification of datasets which record demographic details on the ethnic, national or citizenship status of the population.

As reflected in the above statement, the concept of community cohesion is related to social inclusion, but also involves the extent and nature of segregation, equal opportunities, educational attainment, community safety, population dynamics, social networks, political participation, community engagement and identification with a locality. Some of these concepts can be measured using regularly collected variables, other require special-purpose surveys. Most commonly, they are assessed in regular local ‘user’ and ‘best value’ surveys.
which incorporate questions selected from the Home Office’s citizenship and community cohesion indicator questions (such as ‘how well people form different backgrounds get on with each other) as recommended in ‘Building a Picture of Community Cohesion’ (Home Office 2003). The table below summarises the kinds of (other) variables which can be (or have been found to be) monitored regularly across these dimensions of interest.

(Table 1: Specimen Indicators, Sources and Spatial Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Lowest spatial unit available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Claimant count benefits</td>
<td>ONS/DWP</td>
<td>Ward LSOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour market exclusion</td>
<td>Incapacity benefit</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>LSOA LSOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teenage motherhood</td>
<td>Birth stats Abortions</td>
<td>ONS ONS</td>
<td>Ward Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>Mortality statistics Disability benefit</td>
<td>ONS DWP</td>
<td>Ward LSOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing deprivation</td>
<td>Tenancies Homelessness House prices</td>
<td>CORE/LA CORE/LA Land registry/banks/O DPM</td>
<td>District District Postcode sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>ONS OA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>PLASC</td>
<td>DfES/LEA</td>
<td>Unit postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Ethnic monitoring of all employment</td>
<td>ONS Annual Population Survey</td>
<td>Larger districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Percent achieving success</td>
<td>Key stage 1 &amp; 2 GCSE A-level</td>
<td>DfES/LEA</td>
<td>School/ward/LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Crime statistics</td>
<td>Type of crime by location</td>
<td>Police/CDRP</td>
<td>Varies – postcode for mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racist incidents</td>
<td>Type of incident</td>
<td>Police (RIMS)</td>
<td>District/Police Force Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>Perception of change</td>
<td>Best Value Survey</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population dynamics</td>
<td>Population turnover</td>
<td>Migration estimates Change in electoral register</td>
<td>ONS Local authority</td>
<td>District ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>Contact with neighbours/ other ethnic/social groups</td>
<td>How often talk to neighbours Which ethnic or social groups come into contact with</td>
<td>Community Cohesion Survey (sample)</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political participation</td>
<td>Electoral registration</td>
<td>ONS./Local authority</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting patterns</td>
<td>Election results</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is clearly a problem in bringing these indicators together, as some derive from regular official statistics, other from administrative processes and other from special purpose surveys. They are collected for different spatial units, and at different time periods and regularity (e.g. Best Value surveys only every 3 years). Some are population-based, other use samples (often small samples). Moreover, some of these indicators can only be obtained through analysis of individual data (e.g. the PLASC data) and are hence subject to Data Protection Act/ethical constraints on usage and sharing between data collectors.

This review was begun at a time when needs for data on population characteristics and change are apparently increasing but are also under challenge. Further, the future of the Census and other national data collection is under scrutiny from various directions. Following the 2001 Census and the perception that the Census was systematically missing an important section of the population, the ONS started to consider the option of moving to a population register. It is clear this will not happen in the short term, but there is a strong possibility that 2011 may see the last traditional Census. The current Annual Population Survey is the fore-runner of the Continuous Population Survey to be introduced later this decade, which will bring together survey and administrative records to provide greater inter-censal detail on basic demography. At the same time, the needs of policy-makers and practitioners for local data on the changing nature of the population are growing and other exercises aimed at identifying new migrants and population dynamics are being commissioned; including the ODPM State of the Cities reports, while the GLA has commissioned research on identifying migrants in London. ONS is also developing regular small area population estimates and ethnic group population estimates/projections for districts and larger areas (Large & Ghosh 2006) and has released estimates of population turnover at the local scale.

There are, in fact many data sets which can potentially yield very detailed information on local population dynamics, especially for socially excluded populations. However, there are major challenges in linking the potential data sets together and devising systems for generating regular data at the local scale.
3. Identifiable Communities and Groups

It is important to recognise that a number of different descriptions and sets of categories are used to describe diversity within the population: from the perspective of policy makers and practitioners, and in the political discourse, each may have different resonances or significance. Some of the following sets of categories or ‘types’ of diverse groups overlap, while others may be mutually exclusive: all have been mentioned as presenting some kind of challenge to community cohesion, or as possessing specific needs. It is virtually impossible to create a superset of categories which would reconcile and incorporate all of these, since some operate at one level or plane of diversity (such as nationality which is legally defined but changeable) while others relate to individual identity or to perceived identity. The following is an attempt to describe the key groups of interest to service providers and public debate who might be identified in the process of the monitoring of the demographic components of population change in the UK situation. We have not been able to identify datasets which describe all of these categories at a national and small-area level.

Asylum Seekers / Refugees
The principal group of concern, in terms of recent public or media expression, is the population of refugee origin, which frequently refers in practice to asylum seekers, rather than admitted and settled refugees with ‘Geneva Convention’ clearance. There remains considerable confusion between these statuses, and the varying types of ‘temporary protection’ awarded to those with limited leave to remain. However, with the possible exception of Home Office statistics, the majority of research and monitoring does not make any formal differentiation between the numbers of those here with indefinite leave and those still seeking resolution of their applications for protection – and indeed, those whose applications have been refused and who are either awaiting deportation, are in the UK illegally, or have been awarded exceptional leave to remain. Recent controversy over the ‘release’ of ‘foreign criminals’ was typified by this type of confusion (see for example Self 2006). It is also virtually impossible to decide when a long-term settled population of refugee origin (such as the Vietnamese or ‘Ugandan Asian’ – or post-war Polish and Ukrainian communities) should no longer be regarded as ‘refugees’. In terms of community cohesion, it is likely that the groups of greatest interest are those seeking asylum or on temporary visas: changes in regulations now suggest that few will be expected to settle permanently, but equally, birthplace data do not necessarily indicate civil status.

Migrant Workers
This is perhaps the most difficult group to define, but apparently presents the fastest growing sector of the economy and the sub-group of population most problematic for service providers and community cohesion. SOPEMI reports indicate that since 1997 numbers of migrant workers have multiplied massively, mainly due to third world/US people coming in on work permits to meet the labour needs of the NHS, hospitality (service sector) and IT industries. In recent years, since the relaxation of UK borders in anticipation of A8 countries’ accession, numbers of European (especially eastern European) origin have risen, and there are increasingly reports of significant numbers of seasonal or casual workers of Portuguese origin in rural areas of eastern Britain. Local and national spokespeople were in agreement that migrant workers of this type form an essential element of the economy, but are barely regulated. Further, they are a highly diverse group, mostly now of European origin but ranging from highly educated to unskilled, and including permanent and seasonal workers, some in family groups and
others single (DEFRA 2006). Most information on the nature and number of members of these groups comes from ad hoc surveys and specific enquiries into the issue, such as those conducted by the IPPR (Kyambi 2005). That review noted that (relying largely on data from the regular Labour Force Survey and International Passenger Survey) current ‘new migrant’ groups are much more likely to fall in the 25-44 age group, and few are under 16: there is frequently a gender imbalance, but groups from different national origins show differing patterns with some roughly equal (Nigeria) and others much more female (e.g. Denmark- or Czech born) while others are predominantly male (Algeria, Iraq; new migrants in the North-East region). In general, new migrants are much more likely to be in the lowest earnings category – but also more likely than the UK-born population to be in high-earnings groups. It remains true that new migrants – overall – tend to be located in areas of pre-existing settlement of that national origin, but they exhibit high levels of internal diversity and are often strikingly different in profile from settled migrants of the same birthplace. All of these data are subject to problems of projecting from small samples and irregular survey dates or difficulty in linking to Census data.

Local informants suggested that some data could be obtained via ‘gangmasters’ and informal labour recruiters, while in theory some national data might be available on those who chose to register with the Department for Work & Pensions to obtain credit towards benefits entitlement. Neither of these sources is likely to provide a robust estimate or high proportion of coverage: since many workers are highly mobile and essentially ‘temporary’ and usually healthy, they will also not in general be registered with health or other service providers except for exceptional purposes (emergency care). It is clear that this group is also liable to high levels of occupational hazard and may be responsible for local social tensions, although much evidence is anecdotal.

A report from DEFRA indicates that some regional economic development agencies may hold or at least collate ad hoc reports on the numbers of migrant workers in rural areas. It was estimated that in 2005 there were at least 80,000 ‘migrant workers’ employed in the Eastern region (DEFRA Press release 2006). Many of these reports can also be located via the Regional Observatories (qv). Without better descriptive data on the characteristics of members of this group it is not possible to identify regularly collected data sources that will enable us to identify or monitor them.

In theory, it might be possible to obtain information about certain groups of migrant workers from the Work Permits scheme managed by Work Permits UK – an arms-length agency under the umbrella of the Home Office. We were unable to pursue this line of enquiry in the time available but were aware of some controversy in the media.

We note that the Audit Commission is currently undertaking a review of data, issues and processes relating to Migrant Workers. The report of that review was not available in time for its conclusions to be incorporated into this report. We understand however that there may be some possibility of gaining information from local employers through local informal linkages: some Local Authorities in rural areas have made an estimate of the number of migrant workers as a result of talking to agricultural employers: similarly in some (urban) areas the migrant workforce is highly concentrated in the construction and hospitality industries.
“Ethnic Groups”: BME – Black and Minority Ethnic (Visible) Minorities
The majority of available data relating to diversity in the population reflect continuing interest in ‘ethnic monitoring’ in relation to the awareness of racialised inequality (see Culley 2006, Johnson & Gill 1995) and exclusion which was documented in a series of academic and official reports from EJB Rose’s pioneering ‘Colour and Citizenship’ (1969) to the ‘Stephen Lawrence Enquiry’ (Macpherson 1999) and the Race Relations Acts which have legitimised and institutionalised such monitoring as a means to prevent illegal discrimination. Because of the history of the struggle leading to this acceptance, the focus has almost entirely been on groups who are frequently described as being of ‘Black and Minority Ethnic’ origin, and who were previously identified through Census data as being of ‘New Commonwealth’ origin: that is, primarily ‘visibly’ different groups with their ancestral origins in South Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. The legislation does also cover, and evidence suggests disadvantages associated with, origins in the Mediterranean and Irish people, who are otherwise included in the ‘white’ majority population but whose ethnic identity is not always recorded as a distinct category. The focus on ‘ethnic group’ however, improves on earlier data where ‘birthplace’ was the key recorded descriptor (as it still is for Vital Statistics registration data concerning births and deaths).

The principal source of descriptive data on ‘ethnic group’ categories (or ‘ethnic origin’ – strictly these are not quite identical concepts) is the classification adopted by the Office of National Statistics for the decennial census of population. This was first adopted in 1991 and revised for the 2001 census, following extensive consultation and debate. The classification has been actively promoted by ONS and DH guidance on ethnic data collection. The groups are not totally consistent between censuses, and rely on several different dimensions, which may be almost equivalent in popular debate but are nevertheless conceptually different (geographical ancestry, ‘colour’ and nationality). Since the adoption of a consistent classification for the 1991 census, and the availability of a national breakdown of population at small-area scales to provide a reference base, these groups have become the de facto standard for most data recording and analysis. Most agencies have now adopted the revised classification used for the 2001 census, which provides 16 main categories, and can be further simplified into four or five major groupings. (see Table). Less often reported, but available within the ONS and presented only in one national table, is the use of a much fuller list of ethnic group categories including those ‘written in’ by respondents seeking to self-identify. Similarly, the census continues to ask for country of birth, which provides data of relevance on ‘new migrants’. However, the coding of even this does not break down all areas or origins equally, so that certain regions are only described broadly while other national states from which historically significant numbers of migrants have come, may be listed individually (e.g. Nigeria, ‘West African not elsewhere stated’, or Hong Kong and ‘Other Far East’). Commentators and practitioners have reported significant difficulties, not only in the use of the ‘Mixed’ and ‘Other’ categories but also in using that birthplace data to identify new or significant distinctive groups of migrant origin.

The Office of National Statistics is at present consulting on the questions to be used in the 2011 census (to be field-tested in 2007) which may offer an opportunity to influence what will be future standard categories for base data and hence other agencies’ data collection practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>White – British</td>
<td>White – British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White – Irish</td>
<td>White – Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White – Any other White background (please write in)</td>
<td>White – Any other White background (please write in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other...)</td>
<td>Mixed – White/Black Caribbean</td>
<td>Mixed – White/Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed – White/Asian</td>
<td>Mixed – White/Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other mixed background (please write in)</td>
<td>Any other mixed background (please write in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black- Caribbean</td>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black- African</td>
<td>Black or Black British: African</td>
<td>Black or Black British: African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black- Other (Please describe)</td>
<td>Black or Black British: Any other background (please write in)</td>
<td>Black or Black British: Any other background (please write in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian- Other (Please describe)</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British Any other background: (please write in)</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British Any other background: (please write in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic group</td>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Ethnic Group (Please describe).</td>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic group Any other: (please write in)</td>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic group Any other: (please write in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from ONS forms: reproduced with permission)

The terms used by the ONS in the decennial census have become the de facto standard for ‘ethnic monitoring’, largely because of the availability of a national baseline for comparison. However, certain local authorities and other agencies do use additional codes which can be mapped back into the ONS categories for such comparative purposes but which give greater detail of local value: the same principle applies to the ‘Read Codes’ and SnoMed codes used in NHS records, which are also built on the framework of the ONS Codes listed above.

**Faith / Religious Group**

There is no nationally agreed definition of religious identity or affiliation, unlike the situation in certain other European states where registration as a member of a particular faith group may relate to local taxation or other entitlements. Regular national surveys and data collection from a variety of sources are reported in the handbook/Directory published by the Multi-Faith Centre at the University of Derby for the national Interfaith Network, and national survey data are also reported (also drawing on reports of attendance submitted by some religious groups) on an annual basis in the MARC Europe series of UK Christian Handbooks. It is increasingly being recognised that religious identity may be a significant factor in community cohesion.
The ONS Census also asked a (voluntary) question on Religion which was widely answered and provides basic national and local data on religious affiliation (if not on level of adherence), in eight major groupings: published reports do not enable differentiation between Christian denominations or Muslim (Islamic) traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Census 2001 Question 10 – What is your religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (Including Church of England, Protestant and all other denominations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Religion (write in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from ONS forms: reproduced with permission)

Nationally, there is very little evidence of religious affiliation being recorded, with the possible exception of local use in NHS and social care providers where specific service provision needs may be linked to religion.

**UK Internal Generic Movement**

Population ‘Churn’ (turnover) is probably dominated by internal movement of the UK national indigenous/citizen population, despite the greater attention largely given to migration from external sources. Because of the lack of a system of national registration, there is no reliable way of monitoring this, except through projections from records of transfer between NHS primary care providers (i.e. GP records, which are returned to the national centre when patients leave a GP’s list, via the Primary Care trust responsible for the area in which a GP practices). There is no obligation on individuals to register, or to change their registration when they move residence, although most GPs will not provide services to people who move outside their designated ‘practice area’ (which may have no relationship to formal boundaries) and while technically those leaving the country for more than six months are supposed to suspend their registration, this is rarely enforced. Flows and stocks of population, based on estimates derived from these record transfers, provide the basis for ONS estimates of inter-censal annual changes in the populations of local authorities but are not associated with any detail about age, sex or other demographic characteristics.

The NHS Connecting for Health information technology initiative, operating through the Health Service Information Centre which is charged with developing a single database for all NHS service users, is currently developing the underlying database and proposes within the next five years to manage a single integrated patient information database system, from which data can be extracted through the so-called ‘Secondary Uses Service’. The value and operation of this activity is at present being discussed by a variety of stakeholders: the issue of ‘ethnic monitoring’ has been central to much of these debates.

Other data might in theory be gleaned from Estate Agents, social housing providers, utility companies and credit agencies, as well as by comparison of records in (voter registration)
electoral rolls, but these would require levels of record linkage that are not at present permitted by data protection legislation or possible with existing technology.

**EU Citizens**

Migrants from the European Union (and other associated states within the European economic activity area) can in practice move freely around the UK without needing to register or identify themselves specifically on any particular database. While they are expected to obtain a National Insurance number, which will provide evidence of entitlement for care and assist in collecting insurance payments from wages (of those employed in ‘regular’ workplaces), it now appears that very little checking is conducted on applications for these certificates and numbers. The majority who are legally resident and working (or on holiday) may register for medical treatment on a reciprocal basis but are unlikely to do so unless they have dependants, have a continuing medical condition (‘chronic illness’) or encounter ill-health and a need for treatment (acute or emergency). There is no entitlement to social security in the first six months of UK residence, but some entitlement may be obtained after a period of working in the UK if social security payments are made (and there may be entitlement to ‘in-work’ additional benefits). Again, while there is a theoretical potential (or requirement in the case of A8 country migrants) to register in order to obtain benefits, we were unable to obtain data on the level to which this is effective in practice.

**EU Accession States**

Media reports have given considerable prominence to the presence of migrants and workers from nation states in ‘Eastern/Central’ Europe, some of which are in the process of joining the European Union and gaining full reciprocal rights thereby (the so-called A8 states in particular, workers from which were given rapid rights of free movement and employment in UK). In theory, such people have historically entered the UK on a work permit issued by the Home Office, and are expected to register their presence. Although A8 accession state nationals were supposed to utilise the Workers Registration Scheme managed by the Home Office, it is understood that not all did so. On accession into full membership, such workers cease to be required to maintain such registration and are free to seek alternative work or move within the EU without notification. There were schemes to encourage workers who might be paying social security taxes to register with the DWP, in order to ensure that their credits could be recorded against future entitlement to benefit payments, but there is no evidence of the extent to which this has been taken up. Audit Commission and IPPR enquiries have shown that a proportion of people working illegally or beyond their visa permits in UK are paying national insurance contributions, while others here legally are working unregistered as ‘grey labour’ and making no such contribution.

**Other (including ‘Old Commonwealth’ or Patrals)**

Significant numbers of migrant/travellers from the former ‘Dominions’ (i.e. white-settled areas of the Commonwealth: Canada, Australia, New Zealand and formerly, South Africa) have historically entered UK on a patriot or ‘working holiday’ basis. While this option is no longer available, there are few checks on those who overstay their visas or on the numbers and whereabouts of such ‘citizens of the UK and Commonwealth’, who are entitled to vote and may be recorded on local electoral rolls, but whose actual nationality is not stated. In view of their historic connections and citizenship status, these should be distinguished from ‘illegal aliens’. We note that UK migration and population estimates include an allowance for visitor-switchers and migration-switchers (overstayers).
Disadvantaged and Stigmatised Groups

In papers and discussion of issues relating to community cohesion, there is frequent reference to a number of socially disadvantaged and frequently stigmatised groups, some of whom place specific demands on service providers or affect the perceptions and amenities of local residents (in which category they themselves should also be counted). These groups are best described in terms of their socio-economic status rather than by particular ‘ethnic’, “racial”, religious, national or citizenship characteristics. The following comments are primarily intended to address the extent to which these social groups can be identified from publicly available data, rather than commenting on the degree to which they present threats to community cohesion. That said, since perceptions are clearly important, measurement of the factual basis for such views would be helpful and might assist in the identification of areas of potential social breakdown. We list below a selection of categories for which there may be data, or about which there has been some public controversy and debate. This category would also include people with mental illness, those formerly resident in children’s homes/foster care, former prisoners and former servicemen. All of these may be associated with issues of lower educational attainment, low chances of employment, a higher incidence of drug dependency, and crime or health problems. There are also many homeless people whose origins lie within these groups, and a number of initiatives have been attempted to move such people into hostel accommodation, or out of specific local authority areas. Regular ‘rough sleeper’ counts are conducted, but there is some doubt about their accuracy, and rumours that data may be ‘massaged’ by encouraging rough sleepers to leave an area immediately prior to a count.

Lone Parents

There is no accepted and statistically robust definition of a ‘lone parent’ – and while much of the public reporting assumes that the parent living alone with (and caring for) a child is female, there are small numbers of men who have the responsibility of caring for their own children. Also, mothers may have an advantage in declaring themselves to be lone parents while in fact there is a male partner (temporarily) resident or in a ‘visiting’ relationship (in order to remain eligible for benefit payments). ONS and other data used to estimate this type of household actually report households with a single adult (male or female) and one or more children. While some social services and health care files may record individuals as a single parent (marital status is not recorded, in general), this data is collected and held for specific purposes and is unlikely to be divulged to enquirers.

Youth

The concern about ‘youth’ generally refers to teenaged young people who are not in employment (or full-time education – see Students below), and may be used as a collocation for ‘anti-social behaviour’. Magistrates and police will hold records on the numbers of ‘Anti-Social behaviour orders’ (ASBOs) granted in their area, although these are not exclusively issued against younger people. Such counts of orders issued will not be broken down by demographic data, except perhaps gender, although in theory they might be covered by Section 95 reporting expectations. (see below: criminal justice statistics)

Unemployed

Numbers of people unemployed (or more strictly, not in employment – it is harder to distinguish between those seeking and not seeking work for differing reasons) are reported
regularly by Census, surveys and the DfES and DWP, usually for local authority or regional areas. Data are also monitored regularly by Economic Development Agencies and may be accessed on EDA regional development observatories. DWP also produces detailed monthly/quarterly local area statistics on benefit claimants (e.g. income support, incapacity benefit, disability benefits) by age and gender. Again, these are rarely broken down by other demographic characteristics, except on a sample survey basis which is an unreliable means of projecting change over time. Further difficulty arises from the changing definitions used to describe those seeking work or not in the labour market – the most reliable are the numbers registered for unemployment benefit or as seeking work at employment exchanges: this however is voluntary and not necessarily comprehensive or unbiased.

**Illegal Aliens**

Since the start of compiling this report there have been a number of highly charged newspaper and other media reports relating to the numbers (and monitoring) of ‘illegal aliens’ – that is, people living and/or working in Britain without citizenship rights or work permits and established permits to take up residence. It is clear that there is no single record – indeed, by definition, it will not be possible to hold a register of the numbers of people illegally present, since inflows will not be known (only the numbers detected) and problems have been found in ensuring that those refused settlement actually leave the country. Many such ‘illegal’ entrants are in fact simply in breach of their permission to enter (usually through overstaying their visa duration) and may even be registered as working or paying taxes and national insurance (Farrant et al 2006). Significant numbers found their status regularised when the A8 nations joined the European Union, and similar changes may be expected with other states joining the EU (or indeed, Commonwealth). There has, however, been for many years a concern about perceptions of the numbers of ‘illegal aliens’ in Britain, and any data that can be gathered on numbers of people refused entry or denied settlement and then removed will be of value: for this, improved data handling and tracking of individuals by the IND (Immigration and Nationality) division of the Home Office is required. Recent suggestions by the Home Secretary that those leaving the country should also be monitored by passport control officers might assist in this aim.

**Elders (or ‘Older people’)**

Older people, as with ‘lone parents’ and young people’, create specific demands for health and social care and other service providers, and may affect the social composition and climate of a community. While there are records of numbers of people eligible for state retirement pension and similar social security benefits held by DWP, and social service departments (adult care divisions) will hold records of numbers using their services, there is no reliable register of older peoples’ numbers. The Census remains the main basis to estimate population age profiles, updated annually by reference to birth and death registration. Some data on specific sub-sets of the population might be obtained by examination of specialist housing provision data.

**Travellers (Gypsies, Roma, Irish Travellers, New Age travellers)**

A frequent cause of lack of community cohesion, particularly but not exclusively in rural and suburban areas, is conflict between traveller and settled populations over the creation of illegal ‘camp’ sites without planning permission, particularly since the duty for local authorities to provide sites was abolished. There are some data on sites and estimates of population produced by DCLG (formerly ODPM), and local authorities are supposed to maintain not only a register but also annual counts of caravans in their area. We were
advised that these data are quite unreliable and frequently out-of-date or based on projections from previous years and ‘known’ sites.

Students
There have been reports (most recently from the city of Leeds) that tensions have arisen over the numbers or proportions of (university) students living in, or moving into, an area. This is associated with areas being dominated by “buy-to-let” speculative purchase by landlords, creating a transient population with little connection with the local community, which might therefore indulge in anti-social activities. While the census can be used to estimate the number of people in full-time education, significant numbers of students, particularly in Further Education establishments, are registered as part-time learners. Universities and colleges do keep records of the numbers of students (full and part time) registered for qualifications, and will be able to map their term-time and ‘home’ addresses and whether they are UK, ‘EU’ or International (overseas) fee-paying). Most Universities and some colleges will also have data on approved accommodation providers, which can give some estimate (only partial) of the numbers and location of student residences. Local Authority informants were doubtful of the degree to which such data could be relied on or were kept up-to-date, and it is unlikely that the ethnic or national origins of students could be mapped onto location data of registered student accommodation. It may be possible for Universities to provide some estimates of the number and location of some groups of ‘international’ students, which would be of some value.

People with chronic conditions
In terms of service provision, the location of populations with long-term health or social care needs is a crucial data element. However, although the decennial census asks a question on ‘limiting long term illness’, and certain diseases are ‘registerable’ (see Public Health, below), there is no consistent national set of data which can provide estimates on the prevalence of such diseases, although Hospital Activity Analysis data (on admissions and discharges) may provide some estimate of the numbers using and leaving inpatient care. Certain conditions are well provided with support groups, who can provide data on their membership or estimates of local need. A few diseases (notably Cancer) are recorded in disease registers, as are the clients of specialist clinics (sexually transmitted diseases, rheumatology disorders etc) but it is unlikely that these highly sensitive data would be shared, or be of great value for monitoring community cohesion.

People with disabilities
There is statutory provision for the maintenance of a register of individuals with visual impairment (registered blind or partly sighted): this data is normally held by a local authority but in some cases is managed through a ‘Local Society for the Blind’. Increasingly, additional data on age, sex and ethnic origin are recorded on registers, but they tend to operate at the level of local authority rather than smaller areas.

Other impairments are less easily tracked, although the issues of ‘Blue Badge’ permits for car users by local authorities on the basis of a GP-signed form can be analysed by recourse to the appropriate department of a local authority. The issue of such ‘badges’ depends on local conditions (such as provision of reserved parking spaces and competition for such resources), the propensity of doctors to sign forms for them, and the voluntary action of potentially eligible people to apply for them.
**Public Health Concerns**

A number of diseases or conditions are subject to statutory reporting requirements when diagnosed, and in theory at least public health departments in primary care trusts, and public health observatories, can provide data on the incidence (rate of new cases) of such diseases: the residences of people with some conditions may be identified if required for public protection. Arrivals of migrants from overseas origins are in theory checked and cases of TB and similar public health-threatening diseases are reported to local authorities and health agencies: there is no clarity or consistency in this process and many cases are undetected (Coker 2003). The immigration (‘port health’) authorities notify the local authority designated as the first proposed place of residence by the examined migrant: there is no obligation to report changes of address or even to stay in the place they state, and not all local authorities follow these up, although some London authorities have been active in developing their processes. Public Health Observatories do generate local data and maps on health status and outcomes for public use, and many local authorities referred to these, but few provide breakdowns by ethnic group or other similar information ([www.pho.org.uk](http://www.pho.org.uk)). Recently, local profiles have been made available for nearly all 388 Local Authority areas in England: ([http://www.communityhealthprofiles.info/](http://www.communityhealthprofiles.info/)). The Scottish National Resource Centre for Minority Ethnic Health can provide similar data for Scotland.

**Poverty & Low Incomes**

A key measure of social disadvantage and challenge to community cohesion is income and poverty. Since the ONS decennial census has never included an explicit question on income, the majority of estimates of this dimension have been based on proxy measures (including the ‘social class’ or socio-economic group measures of occupation,) and housing amenities. Benefits uptake and similar data from the social security system (via DWP) can also provide some guidance to areas of need, but are dependent on local office catchment areas, and the propensity of individuals to claim their entitlement – and cannot take account of undeclared incomes. A fuller review of what data and estimates are available is contained in a London GLA report (Leeser & Spence 2004). Very few data are available at small-area level, and many are based on estimates or modelling exercises, although the Inland Revenue (HMRC) have in the past been able to provide estimates for governmental purposes. Commercial agencies also use modelling and survey data to provide estimates for private sector clients.
4. Agencies and Associated Data Sources

There are a very large number of Governmental and non-governmental bodies responsible for collating data at a national level which might be of value to the monitoring of community cohesion. The following sections describe the key agencies responsible for data which might have a breakdown relevant to concerns about populations described in terms of cultural diversity, migration and ethnic origin.

**Census and National Statistics: ONS**

The Office for National Statistics (formerly the OPCS: Office of Population Census and Surveys, and incorporating the General Register Office) is the main source of published data on characteristics of the national population. These are based on a large number of sources, usually with an element of comparison with the decennial Census, but including surveys conducted by ONS such as the Labour Force Survey, General Household Survey, British Crime Survey, British Household Panel survey or Northern Ireland Survey of Health and Social Wellbeing – all of which routinely incorporate the standard ONS questions on ethnic group. In addition, it is responsible for a large number of ad-hoc studies, and publishes data from other sources (such as the DH Health Survey for England, Morbidity Statistics from General Practice, school exclusion data and Civil Service personnel monitoring) in its journals and occasional publications. While most data are analysed by the five and 16 category system of ethnic group identity codes, there is a possibility of examining data where groups have felt sufficiently strongly to ‘write in’ their origin under an ‘Other’ category, or to impute their characteristics by cross-tabulation with data on birthplace and religion (Gardener & Connolly 2005). However, the remain for the purposes of monitoring community cohesion, considerable problems in reliance on the normal ONS datasets. Primarily, these relate to the long intercensal periods (i.e. ten years between each comprehensive annual national data collection) which lead to major issues of difficulty in estimating the components of change and changes in ‘ethnic’ or other component parts of the population, and while the national census can be analysed at ‘(super) output area’ levels, there are problems in comparing data from national sample surveys and relating them to other projections at differing levels of areal disaggregation (Large & Ghosh 2006).

The Office for National Statistics has a comprehensive website offering access to many sources of data, including most of its own analyses, publications and other articles on their interpretation. It has also placed an increasing number of data sets from the Census and other sources on its “neighbourhood statistics” web site, which includes both a data download facility and an automatic report generator for neighbourhoods (http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/). While these can be requested for a variety of areas including lower-order output areas, parishes and wards, the majority of population are derived from the 2001 census or (in the case of data on child-benefit claims, for example) are of similar vintage. There are some data on hospital admissions and benefit payments, but no indication of the characteristics of residents claiming these. We were unable to locate significant amounts of relevant data of newer derivation at small-area levels. We also note that the pioneering NOMIS information system developed at Durham University has now become web-based under the National Statistics banner.
**Vital statistics: Registration of Births and Deaths**

At present the ONS uses the regular and compulsory registration of births and deaths (‘Vital statistics’) through the General Register Office to derive its estimates of the natural change in population numbers for local areas. While the forms collect data on some characteristics of the parents of newborn children, and the cause of death (and birthplace) of the deceased, there is no current attempt to record other information such as ethnic origin. This has been proposed as part of the current review of this procedure (see Aspinall 2003 or www.lho.org.uk) but has not yet been accepted.

**Department for Constitutional Affairs (DCA)**

The DCA is responsible for a current consultation relating to plans to modernise and update the national register of voters. It is planned to introduce a national central electronic register of eligible voters (CORE) which would centralise the work of local electoral registration officers and provide a web-accessible and continually updatable database. If current registration levels are maintained, this will still omit about 10% of the total population eligible, but the intention is clearly to improve on that figure. However, this will still only cover the population over the age of 18, and will not hold any other data other than perhaps that relating to eligibility for jury duty (as at present) and some other minor details such as registration for postal or proxy voting. These are unlikely to be of major significance for the study of community cohesion – although the relationship between the ‘predicted’ and registered population would itself be an indicator of commitment, and might indicate the ratio of non-UK/EU or Commonwealth citizens to the total population. At present we understand that the DCA does not hold any other data of relevance to our concerns. Local ‘electoral roll’ data have however been used by researchers to locate or estimate populations of South Asian origin using computer-based programmes (notably Nam Perchan, based on work in Coventry and Bradford). These rely on name recognition and the creation of comprehensive databases of names from distinctive cultures: they are of no use in identifying members of communities such as those of African-Caribbean origin whose names are commonly identical with the majority white population. At present, only certain South Asian cultural communities have been mapped for such use but in theory others could be added, such as Vietnamese, Chinese and Greek names (although Lee is a name which is common in both Chinese and English culture).

**DTI**

The Department for Trade and Industry does compile data on employers, but is not believed to be a major potential source for the study of community cohesion. We were advised that the official registers of employing institutions (on which some other surveys are based) did not, at least in some of our case study locations, include more than 70% of known establishments or employees.

**Education – DfES**

The Pupil Level Annual Schools Census (PLASC: England only) potentially allows longitudinal tracking of a pupil over time and space through the Unique Pupil Number. This includes age, sex, ethnicity and achievements. Name and address and postcode information potentially permits linking to siblings and households, and thus it would be possible to calculate pupil and household turnover rates for postcode-based areas. However, this depends on how unique the UPN is, on standardised data recording across LEAs and constant updating of databases in different LEAs to prevent double-counting.
Use of these data requires some care since (as we were advised in London) authorities may access either data on residents or by school attended, and pupils attending schools outside their borough or district of residence may present problems of interpretation or inference. Many schools also conduct an annual language survey, but the formal requirement for this was abolished several years ago and there seems to be some inconsistency over practice. There are also slight differences between the way data are collected for private-sector schools and colleges, and LEA schools. Nevertheless, the PLASC and language census data were consistently reported as being among the most useful sources to test for changes in the composition of communities.

Economic Development (Regeneration) Agencies and Regional Observatories
Regional Observatories -: [http://www.regionalobservatories.org.uk](http://www.regionalobservatories.org.uk/) hold varying amounts of information about research reports relating to migrant workers and migration in their area. Most appear to rely on ONS Census reports, or provide links to reports from research centres such as the IPPR and Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Development agencies like EEDA and EMDA also conduct significant research on migrant workers. There are regional observatories for:

- Eastern England (East of England Development Agency)
- East Midlands (Intelligence East Midlands)
- North East Regional Information Partnership
- North-West Regional Information Unit
- South East England Intelligence Network
- SouthWest Observatory
- West Midlands Regional Observatory
- Yorkshire Futures

There is no Regional Observatory for London although the Greater London Authority publishes statistical reports and works closely with the London Public Health Observatory.

There is also a network of Public Health Observatories covering national regions, which collate key health statistics and hold some data on minority / migrant populations ([www.apho.org.uk](http://www.apho.org.uk)). Each takes lead responsibility for specific topics: the London PHO is the primary source of expertise on black and minority ethnic groups health, and hence by default, migrant issues. However, it generates no data of its own and is dependent on specific studies, Census data and public health data: it has however been lobbying for an enhanced data collection process in the registration of vital events (births and deaths) and the collection of ‘ethnicity’ data (LHO 2003).

Employment and Social Security Benefits – DWP (Department of Work & Pensions)
The most comprehensive national dataset at present operational (with the possible exception of the still fragmented NHS dispersed patient record system) is the DWP Longitudinal Survey (Orwellianly titled the “Master Index”), which links Inland Revenue and DWP benefits data on individuals. This has the potential to track benefit claimants through their lives, using the national insurance number to trace individuals through spells of employment, unemployment and incapacity. Using the postcode, it is possible to trace geographical mobility of claimants and to generate information on the ‘turnover’ of the claimant population in a small area (e.g. a ward). DWP has recently (2004?) started to classify claimants by ethnic group, and Jobcentre Plus should record when a person granted refugee status starts to claim benefit. It should also be possible to identify when
they register for a NI number. The imperfections in the issuance of NI numbers were however recently realised that staff may issue a number when workers were referred by employers, even if they had doubts about citizenship status or entitlement. Of course, the database is exceptionally sensitive and confidential (though DWP have granted access to academics at Sheffield for specific purposes). The Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) publishes a range of statistics based on 100 and 5 per cent samples of benefit claimants. Benefits include Income Support, Jobseekers' Allowance, Housing Benefit, Council Tax Benefit, Attendance Allowance, Disability Living Allowance, and Incapacity Benefit. The Inland Revenue (HMRC) also publish data on Tax Credits.

One possible source of under-used information on ‘new migrants’ are the data collected by DWP on the issuance of new national insurance numbers to migrant workers (largely of EU or accession-state origin) who ask for them in order to legitimise their employment, or to obtain access to health or social benefits. It has been suggested that there are few checks made on the legality of these migrant workers, but that their national (or possibly ethnic) origins may be recorded. This has the potential to locate the beginning of new settlements or concentrations of migrants, although with a low degree of accuracy, and with the possibility of public controversy.

**Gangmaster Licensing Authority**

The newly formed GLA has the responsibility of registering agencies who recruit and manage (usually unskilled) labour on behalf of a variety of employers, usually recruiting and managing seasonal or temporary workers, including migrants. Full operation only began in spring 2006, and the register will only begin to be effective from October 2006. No statistical data are at present collected, nor envisaged, but the registration form does ask registering agencies (Q8) to designate the ‘nationalities’ of their workforces. The Agency reports that it has local officers who are collecting ‘soft’ information to support their own monitoring.

**Health – DH / NHS**

The largest database in the world is said to be the patient record information held by the National Health Service and deriving from the detailed personal records on individual patients held by General Practitioners, linked with prescribing and hospital data. Strictly, these records are the property of the Secretary of State, but in practical terms they are currently effectively managed by GPs and local Primary Care Trusts. Nearly all are now held in electronic form, although paper records are maintained as a backup in most cases. When individuals move their permanent address they may be required to register with a different doctor (and/or PCT) and their records are transferred, through the central NHS Records service in Lancashire (Bootle): such re-registration however depends largely on the initiative of the individual, until they require medical care. In theory also, persons leaving the UK for more than 6 months should suspend or end their GP registration and records should be sent to the central store. Equally, ‘temporary’ visitors and new migrants seeking medical treatment can register with any GP and thus a record for them will be created, containing at least data on their age, sex and address. Recently, a ‘quality points’ indicator was introduced providing a small incentive (about £120 annually) to GPs to record ethnic group information on these records, but this is not retrospective and may have little effect on recording rates. There is an extensive literature on ‘ethnic monitoring’ in the NHS (see Johnson 2001, 1995) and while a national circular placed an obligation on hospitals to collect these data on all ‘inpatient’ users, this has never been achieved.
In the future it is planned that as part of the NHS ‘Connecting for Health’ (formerly NPfIT) programme, all of these records will be combined in a centrally held electronic system which can be securely accessed by NHS staff from any location within the health service, thus reducing redundancy of information gathering and the potential for medical and diagnostic errors due to unrevealed information. The deadline for this programme has been several times extended, partly because of technical problems in creating a national computerised information network for the NHS. As part of the development, the Health Services Information Centre (HSCIC) has a planned programme known as the ‘Secondary Uses Service’, which will extract anonymised data for epidemiological and research purposes, which could also serve the needs of Community Cohesion monitoring. At present, indeed, the best source for net population flows between local authorities is the data from the NHS on transfers between GPs and PCTs available from the change-of-registration data: this information is crucial to the ONS annual population estimates for local authorities. However, at present only very low level data, on absolute numbers of population flows (and with no descriptive content) is supplied.

The NHS does make a record of every ‘patient contact’ and hence a variety of data records currently exist, maintained by the different agencies or outlets providing services. It is expected that the majority of these will eventually be co-ordinated and centrally held on a central national patient database (or ‘single population record’) but there will continue to be paper records and databases of users which are not linked to this. At present, however, only ‘inpatient’ (hospital-based) services are required to ask users for their (self-identified, census-category based) ethnic origin, and levels of recording vary from near-zero to near-100%. Inpatients are also supposed to be asked their religious origin, and non-UK/EU citizens may be asked to demonstrate entitlement to treatment (unless the medical attendant decides that this is ‘immediately necessary’ or justified on public health grounds). There are therefore no data on the national or civic status of service users. Data are also normally based on location of service provision (i.e. hospital or primary care trust etc) rather than the residence of the user, although some data may be available for internal accounting purposes to allow transfer of funds between authorities responsible for different areas.

NHS Direct, the telephone-based service of information and advice to which users are directed outside the normal operating hours of primary care providers, does keep a record of the (preferred) language of its users, and there have been several experimental trials of ethnicity recording. These have been of variable levels of success and only those who explicitly state that they are not confident in English are asked for their preferred language. Few reports have been produced using these data.

It should be noted that some health service data, such as dental records, family planning (and possibly sexually transmitted disease clinic) and opticians records, are not incorporated into the general database or exchanged with the hospitals and GPs.

**Home Office**

The Home Office, as the Ministry with primary responsibility for immigration and nationality, and the functions of the ‘ministry of the interior’, also covering law and order and the enforcement of the Race Relations Acts, is the prime source for much of the data of relevance. Under the provisions of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act, it produces an annual ‘Section 95’ review report detailing a breakdown of its functions and outcomes in terms of gender and ethnicity, including particularly the numbers of prisoners, convictions and other
crime-related activities, and reports of racist incidents. This function is at present being reviewed. It is also responsible for data on asylum seekers and refugees, including acceptances and the management of the NASS (National Asylum Support Service), although recent media coverage and responses to select committee enquiries have revealed difficulties in tracking the exact numbers and location of individuals, especially following the determination of claims for asylum. There has never been any way in which they or any other agency could track the whereabouts of refugees once a claim was agreed and formal refugee (or indefinite leave to remain) status was awarded: this confers the same rights as citizens to free movement, and it would require the introduction and monitoring of identity cards to permit data gathering.

Recent public discussion has centred on the admission of senior officers and ministers that it is not possible to provide or maintain accurate registers of the whereabouts of various groups of population such as ‘overseas criminals’, unregistered or ‘illegal’ migrants, and those refused leave to remain. This problem is not confined to the Home Office, as discussion with other agencies for this review demonstrates.

**Home Office Community Cohesion Indicators:** A set of Community Cohesion Performance Indicators were developed by the Home Office Community Cohesion Unit in June 2003 for local authorities and their partners to use as appropriate to their needs. These are used mostly in annual and three-yearly surveys conducted by local authorities, but we were made aware that not all of the questions were asked on all occasions. We have asked for an indication of which questions are regularly used in our survey of LAs. The indicators and technical notes to assist in their use are available at the IDeA/Audit Commission site http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/communitycohesionindicators.html

**Local Government (Local Authorities)**
Local Authorities all collect and collate vast amounts of data regarding their population. This may vary slightly between rural, urban and unitary authorities, depending on the range of activities and services for which they are responsible. In general, it covers the supply of housing (or housing-related benefits), primary and secondary (and to a lesser extent, tertiary or further) education, amenities (such as sports centres), and voting in local elections, as well as the supply of other relevant locally delivered services. In addition, local authorities have a record of all properties, derived from rating and council tax valuation exercises. They maintain council tax registers (which should also record landlords and owners of unoccupied property) which have Unique Property Numbers and which can be mapped using OS Addresspoint and MasterMap.

While there is no overall consistency or agreed framework for every item of data collected, many of the data are determined by the requirements of central government in its funding role, and are overseen in particular by the periodic inspections of the Audit Commission and its framework for Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA), including ‘KLOE’ items (Key Local Objectives indicators). Visits to selected key informants and case study authorities revealed that there are often problems in communication or data sharing between departments of local government bodies, although most do have some central data management and statistics group function: much data is collected but not regularly analysed or reported on unless demands are made by elected members or inspecting bodies. LAs do however, under Home Office guidance, conduct regular ‘satisfaction’ surveys of residents and users, which include standard questions on ‘community cohesion’
issues. These provide a guide to local perceptions, but changes in perceptions may not necessarily reflect actual changes in population.

Electoral Rolls: One of the most useful and public sources of information on the diversity of the population is the Register of Electors, currently maintained by 390 electoral registration offices based in local authorities but under the oversight of the DCA (see: Department for Constitutional Affairs). All households (or addresses) in the authority area are sent an annual form on which householder are (legally, if not in practice often enforced) required to list the names of eligible voters — that is, those aged over 18 (or whose birthday falls in the next 12 months) who are citizens of the UK, Commonwealth or EU. EU citizens are only eligible to vote in local elections. Certain exceptions exist, and the data are also now recorded on two rolls: one (public) contains more restricted data, and individuals can apply for their details to be further restricted — i.e. withheld from this register, as a means of deterring their use for marketing purposes. There are also serious under-counts among certain populations: at least 10% (i.e. 3.5 million adults) out of the national eligible population is estimated to be unregistered, and recent DCA press releases have suggested that a third of the London Chinese population and 18% of Muslims in London (60,000 of those eligible, based on 2001 census data) were not registered. However, the rolls have been used in the past for name-based analyses (using software originally developed in Coventry and Bradford for this purpose by Ludi Simpson) which can provide estimates of the numbers of people from specific South Asian linguistic/religious communities. (see paper by Gumber available via www.ethnic-health.org.uk). Community groups such as OBV (Organisation Black Vote) have held campaigns to raise awareness and registration among minority communities, although those would not cover migrants from non-Commonwealth or EU states: while Bangladesh was technically outside the Commonwealth, however, many UK Bengali residents maintained their voting status without question.

There have also been in the past suggestions among researchers and political scientists that the Electoral Registration process might be a suitable mechanism for collecting more data: a so-called’ enhanced registration’ process. These suggestions have not so far been acted on, although there were some pilot exercises in the 1980s.

Several Local Authorities have indicated that they are in the process of developing local atlases or databases of relevant data: the Norfolk authorities have collaborated in a study (due to be completed in June 2006) on ‘Black and Minority Ethnic Community Inclusion’ which has been reviewing all sources of data on mobile and minority populations including those employed in the large local agricultural sector, the majority of whom are of European (‘white other’) origin. When completed it is expected that this will be used to develop a sustainable profile (held on the Norfolk CC website) to monitor annual changes in the population. This will collate a variety of sources including interpretation of qualitative and anecdotal information, and that obtained from central government agencies under Freedom of Information legislation. Key factors identified in the process have included the future changes in the states covered by EU common-travel (right to work/open borders) legislation, as states covered by present seasonal agricultural worker permits apply for membership; and the complete absence of monitoring of the (known to be substantial) Portuguese population, which is ascribed to a fear of self-identification following urban (and rural) disturbances in recent years. (see also below: Local Observatories)
The Greater London Authority supports a substantial group of staff working to manage the data emerging from their surveys, administrative procedures and the ONS. The Data Management and Analysis Group (DMAG) published reports and briefings such as the report by Bains (2005) into the use of the Simpson Diversity Index which maps the ‘diversity’ of the city at various scales, and DMAG Briefing 2005/8 which describes the London Pupil Dataset. Other Local Authorities have set about placing such data onto web-accessible archives such as the Leicestershire ‘online atlas’ (LSORA – see appendix).

While until recently many LAs maintained asylum support teams and could provide reasonable estimates of the numbers of people of refugee origin or believed to be claiming asylum, this appears no longer to be the case (LORECA 2006).

Local Government and regional issues: ODPM (Now DCLG)
The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (whose functions have largely been taken over by the new Department for Communities and Local Government, along with some functions previously located within the Home Office) has been conducting a number of studies into community cohesion, and reviews of data. We have drawn on these for this review. It has remained unclear to what extent Local Authorities are regularly reporting and depositing data from their local audits into a central repository: in general, we do not believe that this is happening to any significant degree, and where it does happen, data are not being regularly compiled for ongoing monitoring although annual reports may be searched for data to answer specific enquiries.

Local Authorities (‘Shire’ and Metropolitan Counties, Unitary Authorities, Metropolitan Borough Councils and (rural) District Councils all collect data relating to their responsibilities, such as social care (former ‘social services departments’), education, housing, voting etc: these differ according to the type of authority, and also in the case of housing, responsibility may have passed to an independent social housing provider. Most of these data are attached to routine ‘ethnic monitoring’ questions using ONS Census categories. Regular ‘Best Value’ surveys (normally every three years) and annual cycles of ‘user satisfaction’ surveys are conducted, and some of these results are checked on the (also normally about three-yearly) visits of the Audit Commission as providing data for their ‘Key Local Objectives’ indicators (KLOEs). We present below information on the relative value placed on these in responses to the survey of local authorities undertaken by MSRC for this review, in collaboration with IDEA and ICC. It has however become very clear from responses to questioning in our selected ‘key informant’-based case studies that there is a great deal of variation in the degree to which departments or agencies in local government share information. We have also been advised that much data – although regularly collected along with specific information about ‘race’/ethnicity, gender and disability in keeping with requirements and declarations about equal opportunity policy, is never analysed or used, unless local councillors or other external bodies (such as the CRE, and in future the equalities and human rights commission) make explicit demands for reports.

ODPM has developed a number of relevant web pages offering access to local data, driven by the Neighbourhood Renewal (economic development) agenda. These include www.data4nr.net which was compiled for ODPM by a firm of consultants (OCSI) and the website provides access to their report and signposts datasets available for targeting, monitoring, priority setting and performance management of neighbourhood renewal at a neighbourhood level. It is primarily intended to be of value to those preparing Local Area
Agreements, Local Strategic Partnership coordinators, and others working at a
neighbourhood level.

**NAO / Audit Commission**
The National Audit Office and Audit Commission conduct regular inspections of publicly
funded bodies, and work to published sets of performance indicators and ‘Key Local
Objective’ indicators which the bodies inspected are expected to maintain. Details of the
Audit Commission’s forthcoming report on Migrant Workers and its concerns about
community cohesion were not available in time to be incorporated into the final report of
this study. The NAO has a good record of enquiring into equality and Diversity
management issues in its inspections and reports, although it does not collect data of its
own which would be of use to monitor social and community cohesion. Both have a role to
play in ensuring that national and public bodies do maintain good reporting and recording
procedures and provide high quality data.

**Police - National Security, SOCA**
Police, and local Crime Reduction Partnerships, are a reliable and important source of data
on issues relevant to community cohesion. Many of the reporting requirements relevant to
the police are covered in the discussion of Home Office data, the requirements of the
Police & Criminal Justice Act (‘PACE’) and the review of Section 95. Reorganisation of
police forces through mergers (currently being discussed) and the implementation of
reforms to combat serious organised crime may mean that better data become available, or
that they become less accessible or are not provided for smaller areas: we were unable to
explore this issue in time for this report.

**Social Services**
While social services departments (now divided into Children and Young People’s
services, and Adult services) have historically been among the most active in recording
ethnic origin, language and culture data regarding their clients, in order to assist in service
delivery (notably in child care cases), it appears that this may no longer be true. We were
unable to obtain detailed descriptions of current practice, but are aware that as most of the
data relate to children and vulnerable adults, there are likely to be strong objections placed
in the way of accessing any individual records. Data on specific client groups may be
available (see for example registers of Blind and Visually Impaired people), but these will
only relate to very specific subsets of the total local populations.

**Other Social Observatories & Think Tanks**
While not repositories or collectors of routine data, there are a number of independent
‘Third Sector’ and academic agencies with a specific interest in matters relating to
community cohesion, migration and population monitoring. Those mentioned below have
all set up websites or published reports which deal with aspects of this study, and may
provide access to reports or other forms of data of relevance, as well as its interpretation
and debate.

JRF: Joseph Rowntree Foundation: [www.jrf.org.uk](http://www.jrf.org.uk)

IPPR: The Institute for Public Policy Research: [www.ippr.org.uk](http://www.ippr.org.uk)

COMPAS: the Centre for Migration Policy and Society, University of Oxford:
[www.compas.ox.ac.uk](http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk)
ICAR: The Information Centre for Asylum seekers and Refugees www.icar.org.uk

We have not included in this list other academic and population research centres (such as SOPEMI) whose focus is more on international aspects of migration or those who primarily deal with human rights issues or welfare or campaign on behalf of minority groups. A fuller list of these has been compiled by MSRC/CEEHD in collaboration with the Wales Equality & Diversity network and can be made available on request.

**Other Local Observatories**

Local authorities in England have recently begun making much greater use of Geographical Information Systems to analyse socio-economic data and make it available to their residents. There have been a number of drivers behind this:

- The much greater availability of Census and other socio-economic data, in electronic form;
- Improvements in PC technology and rapidly falling cost of processing power and data storage;
- Development of the internet and world-wide-web;
- Great improvements in mapping and GIS technology, and greater availability of map datasets;
- The UK government’s “e-government” agenda.

The delivery of statistics using web-based mapping has occurred in tandem with the increased use of web sites for delivery of services (e.g. through putting information and application forms/procedures on-line). Statistics and local demographic reports are usually provided by the local authority research and intelligence section. Nevertheless, there is clearly a problem in bringing these indicators together, as some derive from regular official statistics, other from administrative processes and other from special purpose surveys. They are collected for different spatial units, and at different time periods and regularity (e.g. Best Value surveys only every 3 years). Some are population-based, other samples (often small samples). Moreover, some of these indicators can only be obtained through analysis of individual data (e.g. the PLASC data) and are hence subject to Data Protection Act/ethical constraints on usage and sharing between data collectors. Examples of such local authority web pages (e.g. Cambridgeshire and Worcestershire) are presented in the appendix below. Increasingly, these are becoming quite sophisticated in their operation: the recently revised Leicestershire Statistical Online Research Atlas (LSORA.net) permits the overlaying of data from different sets onto a single map: this site (and some others) may require user registration before use. Another development has been the creation of “observatories” by Regional Development Agencies, paralleling the development of regional public health observatories, which provide access to regional and local data and research reports. While regularly updated, they are not used for monitoring. Further examples are given in the appendix to this report.

However, a web search uncovered no examples of local authorities using GIS in dynamic monitoring of community cohesion. The nearest activity is probably crime mapping, being increasingly adopted by police forces and crime and disorder reduction partnerships in order to identify causal factors underlying crimes such as burglary, which contribute to creating insecure neighbourhoods with low levels of cohesion. One of the earliest adopters of this technology was Merseyside.
A selection of web pages from local observatories is presented in an appendix.

Housing and Accommodation Related Agencies

Clearly it might be expected that one of the best sources of data on population movement and composition would be derived from housing records. These will almost invariably contain small-area location information, and cover the vast majority of the population. However, the market for accommodation is fragmented, between public (social housing provision including ‘local authority’ or housing associations or other forms of registered social landlords, some of which have taken over stock from local authorities – the so-called former ‘council housing’) and rented accommodation which may be private, but furnished or unfurnished, shared or sole-rights, ‘with’ or ‘without’ meals, and finally, but not least, most people live in private ownership. There is little effective regulation of private rented provision, and while new regulations will ensure regulation of ‘houses in multiple occupation’, the experience of previous forms of such registration and the expectations of local authority officers about the future prospects of the value of such sources of data are not encouraging.

While a small number of people are homeless and these form one of the social problem groups of interest to community cohesion, that population is by definition hard to identify and locate, and very little is known about its precise composition. Studies of homelessness among BME groups have indicated that people from minority ethnic groups are under-represented among the numbers accommodated in shelters or ‘sleeping rough’, while the homeless population as a whole moves between a variety of temporary forms of shelter, including the homes of friends and relatives. Regular surveys of ‘night sleepers’ are conducted, especially by London boroughs, but these have been widely discredited. Such data as do exist in any consistent or coherent form tend to be head-counts with very little data on the characteristics of the population. It is possible however that charities such as the Simon Community and others providing services may be able to furnish reasonably accurate estimates, even including breakdowns by nationality or ethnic origin (Society Guardian ‘Opinion’ column 16 August 2006 p4).

Housing Associations / Housing Corporation/RSLs

The main source of data of value for the monitoring of community cohesion and population demography is the regular reporting system of ‘CORE’ data by all registered social landlords (‘Housing Associations’) falling under the aegis of the Housing Corporation. These do record ethnic group data (using the ONS categories) and for some specialist groups (such as the Vietnamese Housing Association Lin Viet, and some South-Asian oriented organisations such as ASRA, for example) may include more detailed information about ethnicity or language. Quarterly or annual returns can give a reasonably detailed and frequent picture of flows of people in the sector, although moves within an association’s stock, and departures, are not monitored to the same extent. Data may be accessed through the Housing Corporation or the National Federation of RSLs: individual RSLs can access their own data in considerable detail but other users will be restricted in the analyses available because of commercial confidentiality.
**Local Authority Housing**

Many (but not all) local authorities have now lost the responsibility for housing provision, or at least the majority of their housing stock, to housing associations or other forms of management. The remainder do collect fairly extensive data on their tenants, similar to that collected by housing associations, and for input into a similar ‘CORE’ database. For analysis, it would be necessary to collate these data with that from housing association sources. However, as for HAs, the ethnic monitoring information is primarily collected and used as a means of ensuring that lettings are conducted on a fair and equitable basis. Once a letting has been made to an applicant they become a tenant, and at that point, ethnic monitoring records are often seen as no longer relevant and therefore are not maintained or analysed.

**PSLs (Private Sector Landlords)**

There is no requirement on private landlords to collect any data on their tenants, although there is some obligation for them to ensure that tenants are provided with electoral registration forms, and to comply with health and safety regulations. The registration of housing ‘in multiple occupancy’ (HMOs) is currently being revised and enforced but this will not collect data on the characteristics of tenants/residents. In some localities, there are meetings of more significant private landlords with local authority officers (Landlord Forums) at which some qualitative information may be exchanged. We are aware that a very significant proportion of migrant workers and refugees offered leave to remain (as well as asylum seekers on NASS support schemes) are living in private sector rented accommodation. They may move at very short notice between addresses, or be moved, and also it appears increasingly that migrant workers are housed for very short periods of time in relatively small units of accommodation (2-3 bed semis or terrace houses) that do not appear as HMOs.

**Land Registry & Sales**

It was suggested to us that there may be some scope to monitor population turnover and change (churn) by inspection of land registry data or information on transfers by sale. This might be possible at a micro-scale by arrangement with estate agencies, or analysis of names of registered owners, but there does not appear to be any systematic and reliable mechanism extant that would permit this to play a major part in an information strategy. (Similar points might be raised in relation to the registered owner or payer of council tax and rates). These sources are unlikely to provide either ‘ethnic group’, nationality/citizenship or location of origin/destination information.

**House-building Statistics**

Local authorities regularly monitor local house-building activity as part of their planning department statistics (and also some information on refurbishment and demolition) and generally report these data on an annual basis. The number of homes built, their size, type and market segment may provide some limited information about demand and population growth, though developments are generally constrained by market conditions and other planning requirements: these data are not presented on a small-area basis although they could easily be assembled by postcode areas.

**Other Local sources**

A number of possible sources have been identified including:
Private employers (public sector employers may also be able to provide data), especially those known to employ migrant labour or experience high levels of workforce turnover

Universities and other HE – student movement can be considerable in some areas and can include foreign students and those from non-local communities

Local Business and commerce – some local authorities report that they have identified new communities as a result of the changing patterns of demand for particular products and services, such as foodstuffs

Voluntary Agencies – will often provide for particular communities and provide advocacy and assistance on their behalf. More general provision, such as advice on immigration matters or support to homeless people will also provide clues to the changing patterns within local communities.

Surveys and Studies – a number of local authorities have conducted specific surveys to try to identify particular groups, for example the LB of Southwark.

Race Equality Councils or other similar equality partnerships – many of which were originally set up by the Commission for Racial Equality, and which exist to monitor local progress in achieving racial equality and meeting the needs of minority ethnic groups. There have been subsequent changes to the status and organisation of many of these, which may have good grass-roots contacts.

**Private Sector Datasources**

There are also a number of commercial information providers who collect or collate data relating to localities. Most of these rely heavily on ONS Census data, but add other data to this including (for example) analysis of data from electoral rolls, telephone directories and imputed data from surveys. Credit rating agencies also use data associated with postcodes, and the issuers of Credit/debit cards and supermarket loyalty cards collect vast amounts of information about the behaviour and commercial characteristics of their holders. Theoretically, change of address records would yield information on mobility by occupation, age and sex. However, there are likely to be major problems of double-counting, and this data is highly commercially sensitive. While we understand that Experian are market leaders, the website ‘upmystreet.com’ provides an example of the power of this approach, and the company 192.com is believed to have accumulated a very significant database using electoral roll and telephone directory sources. The classification of neighbourhoods into marketing categories by ACORN (CACI) and MOSAIC is well established but of mostly of commercial significance. A recent paper published by the JRF (Burrows et al 2005) provides a useful discussion of the growth of such internet-based information sources and the impact that public use of such data could have on self-segregation and community sorting.

**Regular or Annual National Sample Survey Data Sources**

There are a significant number of regular surveys which ask ‘ethnicity’ or other descriptive questions of respondents, which have sufficiently large sample sizes to incorporate significant numbers of respondents from minority groups. These may have some value, when coupled with robust estimates of national populations or local studies, to estimate
living conditions and needs. In particular, many are used in conjunction with estimates based on census data, to provide projections for the larger minority ethnic groups in UK. They are, however, unlikely to shed light on the needs of ‘new migrants’ who are not identified by the conventional ONS Census 16+1 ethnic group categories (Szczepura et al 2004). The majority are managed by the Office of National Statistics, and details of the variables (questions) recorded are available from the ONS website. Others have been sponsored by Government Departments such as the ODPM. Many research surveys deposit data with the national Survey (Data) Archive at the University of Essex, set up by the ESRC to support academic research: this source of information is unlikely to be of value to on-going monitoring but might be of value in supply of data for building or testing models and exploring key issues

*Key national surveys recording ‘ethnic group’ and sometimes, country of origin/birth, include:*

- Labour Force Survey (annual continuous)
- Survey of English Housing (for ODPM) – Continuous, 20,000 households annually from sample of 25,000 addresses.
- Family Resources Survey – Annual, 20,000 households in England
- English House Condition Survey – (now annual)
- British Crime Survey (continuous)
- The Longitudinal Survey (links to vital event registration and census data)

**Data-Collating and Other Specific Groups**

*Speakers of Languages other than English (ESOL/E2L/NESB)*

One of the major concerns and challenges for Community Cohesion, and one of the justifications for developing a system for monitoring and anticipating changes in the population, is the need to provide support services for people whose competence in English is inadequate to access relevant services. There are various terms used to describe such populations: the term ‘Non-English-Speaking Background’ (NESB) is one, but does not necessarily imply a need for language support. Similarly, ESOL/E2L (English for Speakers of Other Languages or English as a Second Language) classes may be provided but not meet the needs for specialist interpretation, translation of documents and language support (ITALS), which are absolute rights in respect of criminal justice under the European Convention on Human Rights (Art 6.3) and under the Draft Framework Decision of the European Commission under Art. 31(1) of the European treaty. While this only applies at present to criminal justice cases, there are campaigns to get a wider recognition of the need and right for language support, and so certain public sector authorities have joined in consortia (like the Norfolk-based INTRAN) to commission language support. In such cases, major national or regional providers of ITALS services could usefully provide reliable data on the languages used and the level of observed and met need locally (although it must be noted that many Black African service users from central African states are requesting French as their mother tongue).
Geo-Referencing: An alternative approach to measuring population dynamics with data collected by official bodies

Local authorities and other local service providers collect a large amount of geographically referenced data. Local authorities have long had unique property references for rateable value/council tax registers, which have OS 6-figure grid references, or which can be linked to OS Addresspoint and Mastermap and this detailed geographical referencing is also used by utility companies. The postcode requires some address details to provide a precise geographical reference. However, it is almost universal in databases of service providers (housing, education, health, JobcentrePlus, electoral registration), and used in crime recording and by private sector companies and credit providers. House sales (building societies, banks, the Land Registry, Register of Sasines in Scotland) and applications for housing benefit, council housing or housing are recorded by postcode (and address).

Property registers can provide a good indication of change in the physical number of dwellings, but do not provide information on the population within them. The Census provides the most comprehensive information, but its coverage is poorest in the most deprived and mobile areas, in which it becomes out-of-date most rapidly.

An enormous amount of geographically coded data is being collected about individuals, and with their customer references or other identifier, longitudinal information could be derived on a large proportion of the population. The DWP is developing such a resource by linking benefits histories with HM Revenue & Customs tax and NI contributions histories in its Labour Market Statistics system.

At the local scale, linking geographically referenced data would yield a great deal of information on the dynamics of local populations, with a potentially very detailed focus. However, there are numerous barriers:

- Creating data-sharing agreements;
- Ensuring confidentiality;
- Harmonising individual identifiers, so that an individual does not appear to be a different person when they cross a boundary;
- Removing duplicate information;
- Common geographical referencing standards.

Linking such data would be extremely ambitious, and some sources of data (e.g. NHS) might prove too difficult or sensitive to integrate. A further problem would be that if information on ethnicity, nationality, language, social class background or culture is required, this would have to be either linked from Census records or requested in administrative data collection exercises. The first would involve revoking the commitment not to disclose individual Census data for 100 years, and would undermine the integrity of the Census. The second may be preferable, but in repeatedly requesting this information, may antagonise people and would involve major problems in resolving incompatibilities between databases, when an individual records one of these variables differently in each different data collection exercise. A further problem is that the classifications used change over time as the population changes, raising the difficulty of asking somebody to provide the same information again in a different format or working out how answers on different classifications can be reconciled.
5: Current Practice among Local Authorities

The following examples of ‘good practice’ are drawn from visits, audits, internal reports and our postal survey of local authorities, supplemented by interviews with a selection of officers in places believed to have developed strategies to support their needs to monitor population diversity and community cohesion.

Overall, it is clear that there is great diversity in the level of activity and types of approach (and trust in data provision) between local authorities. Clearly, the different responsibilities of District, County and ‘Unitary’ authorities create some difficulties in presenting a single picture, and there do seem to be differences in the degree to which there are local data sharing arrangements between district and higher-level authorities, as there are in the existence (or otherwise) of local strategic and development partnership groupings. It may not be totally surprising that some local authorities see themselves as having ‘no immediate need’ to collect data on migrants and minority groups, but we might suggest that this is a mistake. Indeed, all public bodies now have a statutory duty to maintain a ‘Race Equality Strategy’ which would require such data.

In practice, nearly all authorities stated that the lack of coherent and accessible data on diverse populations was a constraint on their planning and service delivery. A number of points were made, including the need for consistency in government policy and the value of central guidance or support. One local authority wanted a BS8766 database on all residents and businesses. London boroughs relied heavily on the services of the GLA, which was not a facility available to other districts. Data were definitely needed to ‘shape services and collect outcomes’ and drove the provision of resources – and their availability from central government, so that absence of reliable local data made it hard to challenge what were felt to be wrong allocations. One urban district had seriously considered ‘doing a mini-census targeted at areas where significant population change affecting cohesion is known to have taken place’ – and had in fact conducted a district-wide census-like survey several years ago. Others were hoping that a national set of data ‘at local level’ (i.e. at least down to ward) could be made available at an interval of less than ten years.

Overall, it is clear that very few local authorities are collecting data specifically to inform their policy and practice in regard to community cohesion. The majority ‘use data collected for other purposes’ although a small number advised us that they were developing strategies for some specific data collection. (Most were using one or more of the Home Office Community Cohesion questions, usually as part of their regular ‘best value’ surveys, but some had trimmed these in response to budget strictures and there was no consistent use of all questions – see below). Very few had adequate population estimates, although some were now working as part of local (or regional) consortia to develop a common set for projections, although few of these included breakdowns by ethnicity or culture. Some consortia were based around health bodies, and these were more interested in diversity issues, while others were based on Crime Reduction Partnerships or local economic development groupings. The regional Government Office (in the North East) had supported the development of a Regional Cohesion Forum, which had also linked into academic research for support. Nearly all were in agreement that more and better data were needed and that the present situation could cause them problems: one specifically pinpointed the inability of ONS and similar datasets to identify the existence or development of ‘new migrant’ groupings (another noting the lack of data on BME age,
health and attitudes to services), and there was evidence of a move to hire services from consultancies to fill the gap. One group of local authorities had formed links with a Race Equality Partnership and launched a programme of work with a conference, to ensure that all communities were involved. There did not seem to be any regular pattern of partners, some working with NASS and others making their own small area forecasts apparently based on personal local knowledge.

**Population**
The majority of Local Authorities relied heavily on the ONS “Neighbourhood Statistics” and the annual updating of ‘mid-year estimates’, supported by their own insights from service monitoring. These data were generally only of value for overall numbers, and rarely believed to provide much detail. Some places were more sophisticated than others and capable of complex mathematical modelling to adapt the “RG” (ONS) data to local needs, while others compared data with their biennial or three-yearly ‘satisfaction’ surveys of residents. In London, reliance was placed on the GLA, while in outer areas some County Councils had ‘demographic units’ but these were also subject to cutbacks. FHSA (Health Service) data were also used to estimate overall population turnover but these were mistrusted as often being ‘inflated’.

**Health**
Some PCTs (NHS Primary Care Trusts) appeared to be willing to collaborate with local authorities to provide access to, or analyses of, GP registrations and the use of ‘walk-in’ centres: one specifically indicated that ethnicity was an issue, while others were only obtaining crude overall data on turnover. A few local authorities referred to collaboration with or provision by the Strategic Health Authority’s dataset, and the role of the Public Health Observatories and Cancer Registry, at a broader level of analysis. One LA had appointed a joint PCT/LA Health Improvement Manager who used all data across agencies and another was engaged in a joint project with their local PCT and the SHA to analyse data on GP registration and the use of the ‘walk-in’ centre, noting that ‘ethnicity is an issue here’. At least one LA appeared to have obtained small-area estimates using data extracted from GP registrations but we believe that this was restricted to age/sex and postcode area information. The current state of Ethnic Record Keeping in primary care is highly under-developed, while few acute trusts (hospitals) have reached expected levels of coverage on inpatient users.

**Crime & Disorder**
Most Local Authorities are members of a local Crime Reduction Partnership (or Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership) and share data with local police forces on levels of recorded crime, or extract relevant data from local Crime Surveys and Community Safety surveys. Some conduct three-yearly Crime Audits, which may include attention to ethnicity data. One reported a locally commissioned Quality of Life survey for their CDRP, and that ‘Neighbourhood Profiles’ were being prepared by the police and local area committees. It was evidently possible to obtain and use software that could provide daily/weekly/monthly updates on crimes mapped by postcode but analysis varied from this to quarterly or annual: not all could examine patterns by ethnicity (of victim or perpetrator).

**Education**
Virtually all Local Authorities referred to the central role of the PLASC (Pupil Level Annual School Census) and regular analysis of the central pupil database maintained as
part of schools’ management information systems. A few continue to conduct their own language census exercises but ‘this will be redundant when this information becomes mandatory as part of the DfES collections next year’. Data was not always shared to District levels by County bodies responsible for education. Clearly, the regular and almost universal operation of the schools database provides the best and most consistent source of information on population change (in selected age and demographic groups) and the changes proposed by DfES may assist this.

**Employment**

Data on issues relating to employment were surprisingly sparse and inconsistent. There was the potential to examine data on VAT registration, Home Office data on ‘overseas workers’, an annual police survey of local farmers to identify groups of seasonal migrant workers, and some LAs referred to data from their local Job Centre and the annual Labour Force Survey (again at a larger regional level) – only one obtained monthly updates of JCP data on a GIS database, and another relied on ONS monthly statistics which did not give detail on the characteristics of employees, as well as some occasional local surveys (or a larger biannual survey of employers). Interviews suggested that a high level of reliance was placed on informal sources of information and small reliance placed on official statistics as being largely flawed.

**Housing**

Several LAs had regular meetings with a Private Landlords’ Forum, and many also organised housing needs surveys at varying intervals. Some had access to choice-based lettings data or information such as street counts of homeless people and rough sleepers. Only one mentioned analysis of housing benefits claims data, and another referred to information gained from the Home Office IND website regarding households supported by NASS. Many no longer have responsibility for housing, and not all districts which have, pass that data to their higher-level county bodies. There seemed to be less concern generally about housing-based information, although RSLs can access very detailed analysis of lettings data on the Housing Corporation joint centre CORE (Continuous Recording) database which actually comprises three sets: on ‘current stock’ profiles of general family and sheltered homes, supported housing, and sales/shared ownership and right-to-buy housing, including (ONS16) ethnicity and postcode data. There are however no data on where people go to if they leave. It may be possible to estimate offers of housing made to ‘refugees’ and those rehomed because of racial harassment, but these categories may not be identical with Home Office definitions and ‘Other White’, disability and language categories are not defined.

**Ethnicity, Culture & Faith**

Few LAs had any independent sources of information regarding the ethnic or cultural breakdown and change of their populations. Some were able to estimate change based on their service delivery monitoring, compared with the ONS neighbourhood statistics data, but this might assume that there was no improvement (or deterioration) in uptake rates across ethnic groups. One mentioned having its own annual ‘BME Survey’ which was conducted in ‘close collaboration with the ethnic community council’, and another was linked to a local Faith Forum. Some information on faith profiles was suggested from the SACRE (Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education) and others stated that they had ‘good links’ to local faith leaders, although others regarded this is problematic due to the propensity to offer ‘inflated figures’. It was possible to get some estimate of ethnic
profile from regular sample surveys according to a few LAs, but for the majority there was no consistent attention to the issue.

**Travelling Populations (Gypsy/Roma)**
Data on these populations was seen as problematic, and not always a locally significant issue. Most contributed to the regular ODPM ‘caravan counts’ and a few held specific ‘travellers needs surveys’, or relied on the work of a designated officer in charge of ‘permanent sites’. Further (less statistical) evidence was drawn from a variety of sources including environmental health, police, schools and social services reports, or occasional research projects.

**Asylum Seekers/Refugees**
In areas designated as reception areas by NASS, there was often an Asylum Support team who were generally well informed and kept up-to-date records. Other areas used the experience or insight of Race Equality Councils, local research or the IND website, but there was no consistent attention paid to these issues or monitoring of ‘unofficial’ settlement.

**Attitudes of Local Residents**
Nearly all local authorities felt that they were in touch with, and monitoring, resident opinion, usually through annual surveys (in about half of cases), or three-yearly ones (usually for the national Best Value exercise) and some had smaller but more frequent ‘citizens panel’ surveys, although we were unable to establish how representative these were. Comments made included the observation that ‘If we don’t know who the population is it is hard to target consultation and surveys’, and that as they were dependent on ‘how the community feels, so ongoing grassroots feedback is needed’. There was in one area especially concern about the uptake of homes in new major housing developments, and so (retrospective) case study research was planned.

Analysis of the pattern of use of the ‘Home Office’ CC questions showed that while nearly all LAs used at least one of these questions, particularly CC4 (‘you can influence decisions’) and CC3 (‘which issues are most important’) CC1 and CC5 were less often used, and CC10 (‘where you meet other ethnic groups’) by less than a quarter. These seem to be relatively ‘soft’ indicators of community tension and we were unable to identify any consistent use that might indicate to what extent they could be used to predict emergent tensions. The national report of the Citizenship survey does not seem to show that diversity or population turnover was associated with any such analysis or conclusions, and it might be worth revisiting these data to seek to prove or disprove this hypothesis.
6. Conclusions and Recommendations

It is very evident that there is a need for data on the characteristics and turnover of local populations and that such a development would be widely welcomed at a local level. At present, data collection and monitoring is patchy, piecemeal and poorly utilised. However, this is not surprising since little thought has been given to this to date. There is, therefore, an urgent requirement for guidance and support of local, regional and national agencies in collecting or collating, analysing and using such information and also for mechanisms to ensure sharing and co-ordination of data. This can be based upon the data and sources available from the various agencies identified in this report, and this will begin to provide a cumulative picture, which can be enhanced by improving the data collected and over time.

The existence and maintenance of community cohesion is clearly dependent on the state of inter-group relationships as much as it is on the social capital of specific groups making up a community or population. There is a longstanding interest in the concept of a ‘plural society’ and a variety of statistical and ethnological approaches have been used in its investigation. Many of these have been used as tools in social planning. Community cohesion is however not simply a matter of mapping groups and drawing inferences. Nor are all the data available that might be required in an ideal managerial society. Present day city managers in local authorities and governmental information units rely heavily on local solutions and local networks of information exchange, and to a certain extent on specific individuals knowledge and insight or connections to information. It is clearly desirable to assist sharing of information and approaches to its use if urban and rural societies are to be developed for the benefit of all, and to reduce conflict or tension between groups.

We have identified a consensus on the potential value of a mechanism to ensure better use of data. We were frequently told that these data ‘ought’ to exist, or that they were being collected but inadequately used. Some local authorities are beginning to attempt estimates of local populations groups and changes, based on local accumulation of qualitative knowledge supplemented by hints from routine statistical datasets. Most would welcome access to guidance on data-use, or perhaps a repository of information on population change and the demographic components of such change, in order to anticipate needs and promote community cohesion. More problematic has been the fact that many of the key data-collecting agencies or data-collection exercises are being reviewed, alongside constant reorganisation of the relevant bodies, and sometimes confusion or change in the responsibility for such data. There are also different spatial units utilised in such data collection. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there is no single source or any regular ‘monitoring’ beyond that represented in the decennial census, that really meets the needs identified. Major national surveys have some potential (provided that one is content with sub-regional rather than local areas) but these do not record details of ‘ethnicity’ or nationality in the sorts of detail that would be required for the identification of ‘new migrant’ groups. No agency, at any level, appears to be collecting data which identifies ‘refugee/asylum seeker’ and the use of categories recording religion and language seems sporadic.

There are certain major and commonly used sources of information which are occasionally used and which appear to have considerable potential to meet the needs identified: these include:
The PLASC (annual school census) data which may build into a longitudinal database and can contain detailed information on family, ethnicity, language and movement. Consistency in the use of this instrument would be valuable.

NHS patient records, with (future) potential of the NHS electronic patient record providing an opportunity for discussions with the Health Services Information Centre about the design and development of the ‘secondary uses service’

The Electoral Roll registrations and the possibility of ‘enhanced’ registration or re-analysis of data (provided that recent changes in the rules relating to these records do not prevent this)

The Department for Work & Pensions longitudinal survey and linked datasets

The registration of births and deaths, with the future possible inclusion of ‘ethnicity’ data in the process to ensure that overall statistics on population growth and data derived from these sources can be used to monitor qualitative aspects of population change: (The Kings Fund and others working with the London Public Health Observatory have made a cogent argument for this and the suggestion is still under discussion but would be an essential element of a national scheme).

The Housing Corporation/ Association of RSLs CORE (housing) dataset and the development of a similar dataset for the remaining ‘local authority’ housing stock

The potential of local sources; the local information-based websites (IBNIS) and the use of GIS in local authority, regional other ‘local atlases’ and other local records and intelligence.

Evidently, well used statistics and information which lead to better community cohesion and prevent or anticipate tensions will facilitate acceptance or development of future systems providing that public confidence in the prospect is obtained.

It is clear that Local Authorities and other statutory agencies have the primary responsibility for collecting and collating information on community cohesion. However, financial and other pressures may mean that this activity has not received the priority it deserves. They are still however, often through informal routes, the means of collecting valuable data, for example through Landlords Forums. It would be desirable to encourage such monitoring and provide a route for sharing and perhaps collating this sort of information centrally, whether via the DCLG or some Observatory and/or the Audit Commission.

These proposals will also require close working with the Office for National Statistics as the primary setter of data templates for national information gathering, and their involvement in any new questions and guidance (and careful attention to the results of the Test Census in 2007). Someone also needs to keep a register of local surveys.

There also needs to be a mechanism or forum for closer discussion and working between the Home Office, Audit Commission and Department for Communities and Local Government about guidance and support for local authorities.
There are other datasets which may have some value or potential, although at present it is not clear that they are collected routinely, systematically or over a large enough area in a consistent fashion, and for some, ownership and accessibility is uncertain. One possible future source of data might be uptake of language-support services, for example, although at present only police and criminal justice services use registered providers in a consistent fashion: there are however some consortia or local service agreements and providers who might provide such data.

There are, however, real concerns about data safety, which must be taken into account. Our research to date has not found an overwhelming argument for linking personal (individual) data, and it seems that most of the desirable outcomes could be achieved by better use of anonymised routine monitoring data, using better collection, analysis and collation of variables on language, religion, culture, ethnicity/ethnic group and citizenship status, as appropriate.

Finally, we believe that this an urgent and pressing need to provide Local Authorities and their partners with a form of template which they can use to bring together sources of information (of all types) and routine statistical data in a way which would give guidance to population change and tensions in their area - as well as helping them to plan and design their services according to changing needs. It would also point the way to which this data collection might need to be improved. Consideration should also be given to some sort of centralised support unit might also be helpful, without necessarily creating a new national observatory body. This could advise and guide – and possibly even compile and analyse reports and data from local sites, comparing them and accessing larger national datasets - whilst providing a local model or template which each area could compile and use. The central unit could also maintain a relationship with (and facilitate interchange of ideas and approaches between) local areas and experts, thus better utilising their diverse systems of monitoring and interpretation.

**Specific and Detailed Matters**

A number of issues have emerged during this study and we believe that it is helpful to draw attention to them at this stage so that they can be further considered.

*We would therefore propose that the following specific suggestions be further examined, especially as part of the next phase of this work: (Note: the ordering of these is not significant)*

**Partnership working** locally should be encouraged, so that all public and independent agencies including local authorities work in partnership with other statutory agencies, the private sector, RECs, voluntary agencies and local strategic partnerships (few were mentioned as being so engaged in our surveys and interviews). This should ideally be facilitated by local authorities who will need to provide leadership and should appoint a named responsible officer to adopt this role. This should be supported and encouraged by Government: public sector agencies feel under pressure to respond to a diversity of agendas and will need to be assured that activity in this area is valued.

**Co-ordination and/or Support** from some Central resource would be desirable, perhaps in conjunction with either an independent institution of Higher Education or Research, or the Department for Communities & Local Government (or both).
The **Office for National Statistics** can play a key role in advising and supporting the development of suitable questions and coding schemes for variables relevant to community cohesion, and ensuring that these are collected in national surveys to provide a baseline for measurement.

The **Department for Constitutional Affairs** could consider examining the potential of the Electoral Roll (and CORE registration of voters) and the development of additional uses and ‘dictionaries’ for software such as *Nam Perchan*.

The **Home Office** could consider making wider use of its S95 data, and whether these can become more widely known and used.

The **National Health Service**, in the move towards an Electronic Patient Record needs to consider the centrality of key variables such as ethnic origin, language and religion for service provision, ensuring that these are provided with consistent coding schemes and locations within all datasets contributing to the overall record

**Primary Care Trusts** in the NHS should consider the potential for ‘Patient profiling’, and ethnic record keeping (data capture) in primary care to feed into the EPR and reduce the need for repeated collection (checking will still be needed at key events: e.g. death and hospital admission)

**Acute Care Trusts** are already under statutory expectations to collect ethnicity data (and religion etc as above) for all ‘inpatient events’ and to establish ‘race equality schemes’. We understand that the Commission for Racial Equality is in discussion with the NHS about their perception that this is not being achieved. These discussions and requirements could be linked to the needs to monitor referrals in a newly framed commissioner-led healthcare system and also to combat possible ‘health tourism’.

**Data Protection** issues need to be debated and consensus guidance made available

**Vital Event** registration (Births and Deaths) could incorporate more data collection on the characteristics of registered individuals including ‘ethnic origin’

Recording of data on ‘**migration status**’ (including identification of refugee and asylum seeker users) might be encouraged, while recognising the risk that this might form a barrier to use of certain critical services: this needs extra consultation.

The **National Asylum Support Service** could develop its ‘case management’ system to be able to derive anonymised and localised data reporting

Agencies in the **Criminal Justice System** could consider monitoring and reporting on the provision of interpreter, translation and other language support services

There is scope to develop, or provide guidance on the use of, the **schools census data** and other pupil level information to give ‘early warning’ of groups of non-English-speaking background
There is at present no substitute for the decennial Census. While we understand that there have been suggestions to replace it with ‘rolling data’ collection, these are unlikely to be implemented in the near future: we feel that it might be worth recalling the value of the intercensal ‘sample census’ (as was held in 1966 and 1976)

The Office for National Statistics should consider the design of the ‘continuous population survey’ in the light of requirements to monitor community cohesion, at least until confirmation of the implementation of a national identity card system and move towards a national ‘population register’ (and thereafter, give consideration to how monitoring outputs can be provided without causing controversy).

The Audit Commission and National Audit Office have a role to play in monitoring the use made of community cohesion data and ensuring that bodies under their inspection are collecting these data to an adequate standard.

The Greater London Authority and other regional Observatories should exchange information and consult together to establish mechanisms or advice and guidance on monitoring community cohesion: ICoCo might organise a national workshop for all of these bodies.

The Gangmaster Licensing Authority has a key role to play and should liaise actively with the Department for Work & Pensions, Work Permits UK and DEFRA, both to collect data more proactively, and to resolve concerns over the issue and use of National Insurance numbers.

The Commission for Racial Equality (and/or the successor body, the Commission for Equality and Human Rights) and local Race Equality Councils, as well as the new Commission on Integration and Cohesion, will need to play a significant role in action and debates over monitoring community cohesion.

Police and Crime Reduction Partnerships could play a key role, but there will be sensitivities about their involvement and this might need careful consultation.

Social Care departments of Local Authorities have historically collected good quality data on sensitive issues including ethnic origin and should reconsider their role and potential contribution.

There is clearly enormous potential for the use of Geographical Information Systems or geo-referencing software: this may require further research.

Housing Registers are under-used, having once been a primary source of relevant data: this may require development of registration of Landlords and in the Private Rented Sector, especially ‘housing in multiple occupation’ and on short lets.

All public data registers (including Visual Impairment and Cancer registries, for example) should be recording key community cohesion variable such as ethnic origin and faith, to meet ‘Race Equality Scheme’ requirements.

It is important to recognise that ‘ethnic record keeping’ is not solely about monitoring ‘visible minority’ groups (as covered by the Race Relations Acts) but is relevant to all
communities including ‘New Migrants’ and minority ethnic groups of ‘White Other/European’ origin.

It is necessary to record and monitor not only ‘arrivals’; but also ‘departures’, both at a national and a local level.

All agencies and political bodies need to recognise the highly specific legal entitlements of different types of ‘asylum seeker and refugee’ and use the terms accurately, while avoiding and discouraging ‘media scare stories’.

There is across all agencies a need for collaboration and development of congruence in agreeing common variables or ‘descriptors’ for data collection, and ensuring that these evolve to reflect changing needs: it is not clear who should lead this process.
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**Other Sources**

The report draws upon visits and interviews and unpublished reports from a variety of sources. We have taken further information from the responses to our survey of local authorities, in whose circulation we were generously assisted by the IDeA. (We continue to receive responses to this). The contribution of the following individuals and organisations is gratefully acknowledged:

Madeline Greene 2006 ‘Population movement in Southwark’ (Institute of Community Cohesion / London Borough of Southwark)

*Central Government Departments and Agencies*
Home Office (and components including NASS, IND etc)
Commission for Racial Equality
Cabinet Office (Social Exclusion Unit)
Department for Education & Science
Department for Work & Pensions
Office of the Deputy Prime Minister / Department for Communities & Local Government
Housing Corporation
Audit Commission

*Individuals (in addition to the Core Team)*
Kirsteen Tait (ICAR/HACT)
Rob Lewis (Greater London Authority)
Dick Tomlins (Independent Housing Researcher)
Will Somerville (Commission for Racial Equality)

*Local Authorities*
Coventry City Council
Leicester City Council
Southwark Borough Council (London)
Lambeth Borough Council (London)
Greenwich Borough Council (London)
Norfolk CC

**Other Bodies**
ICAR: The Information Centre for Asylum Seekers & Refugees – City University
IPPR: Institute for Public Policy & Research
GLA (Gangmaster Licensing Agency)
GLA (Greater London Authority) - Data Management & Analysis Group
NASS (National Asylum Support Service) – Home Office
NHS Health Service Information Centre

**Particularly useful Websites:**

- [www.jrf.org.uk](http://www.jrf.org.uk)
- [www.icar.org.uk](http://www.icar.org.uk)
- [https://extranet.london.gov.uk](https://extranet.london.gov.uk)
- [www.loreca.org.uk](http://www.loreca.org.uk)
- [http://www.raceforhealth.org/](http://www.raceforhealth.org/) (reports on NHS ethnic monitoring)

**Agencies which were NOT approached in this phase of the study**

In the timescale and with the resources available to us we were not able to approach and gather information from a number of other possible Government departments and agencies which might have had some interest in the issue but were deemed to be of less significance. Others were not approached if we did not know of their existence or if we did not expect them to have significant interest in the collation of relevant data.

- DCA Department of Constitutional Affairs
- DEFRA – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- DfID – Department for International Development
- DTI – Department for Trade & Industry
- DCMS – Department for Culture Media and Sport
- DfT – Department for Transport

Citizens Advice Bureaux - CABx: these are also reported to have a close and current perspective on issues of community cohesion since they are frequently the first point of contact for migrants and asylum seekers seeking assistance. They may be regarded as less hostile than some statutory bodies. While they conduct extensive monitoring of their users, we have not yet been able to establish whether nationality and civic status are collected as well as age, sex and ethnic group, or to what extent it is possible to compile a national or regional analysis of reports from local offices.
Background review: Literature on Race/Ethnicity, Segregation and Monitoring

There has been, more or less since the inception of modern social sciences, an interest in the geography and dynamics of intergroup relations, focusing in particular on the relationship between majority ‘white’ and minority ethnic or ‘Black’ groups, supplemented with an examination of the trajectory and behaviour of other minority migrant groups. Robert E Park and colleagues in the so-called ‘Chicago School’ laid out their ‘ecological model’ whereby it was observed that newer, poorer and more socially marginalised groups arrived or moved into the ‘inner city’ (Park RE, Burgess EW 1921). This was generally not the urban core itself but an area surrounding the relatively wealthy urban business district at the historic core of a town. From there, sometimes after forming ‘ghettos’, they would begin to engage in the economic and social life of the city and become mobile, moving upwards and outwards, as further migrants moved in behind them to take their place. There was alongside this, a fascination with the measurement of urban segregation and the measurement of indices of social interaction. The majority of studies, however, have been descriptive or comparative, and rarely predictive of analytical in the sense of relating data to other measures of community cohesion. Indeed, there has sometimes been a sort of assumption that the actual level of diversity or population change was the key issue of concern.

Segregation Indices and Tipping Points

In particular, much social geographical research has relied on the so-called Index of Dissimilarity’, which provides a mathematical estimate of the proportion of the sub-population of interest that would need to move into another district in order to present an even spread across areas (Jackson & Smith 1981). This was widely debated, and it was increasingly recognised that the index contained serious flaws, not the least of which was the degree to which results were not independent of the absolute size of individual populations (or their relative size), and also the size of the areas used to measure and compute the index. There was also some debate about the degree to which this index was asymmetrical – if all of one group lived in an area, but also perhaps half of the ‘other’ also inhabited the same area, was it then segregated (for the minority) or ‘mixed’ from the viewpoint of the majority (Peach 1981). Other social geographers tended rather to use the ‘Isolation Index’ (P*) espoused by Leiberson (1980), which provided a measure of the ‘average probability of interacting with a member of another specified population’ (see Baboolal 1981). This does assume, as with all such indexes (such as the Location Quotient or Weaver’s Crop Combination Index: Sims 1979), that geographical propinquity – even, sharing the same physical space, is the same as social interaction and that such exchange of social and economic capital takes place proportionate to the degree of mixing observed. Nevertheless, a key focus of interest has been in the notion of the ‘tipping point’: the level or ratio between minority and majority population in an area after which majority ‘flight’ takes place and the area (at least in theory) becomes predominantly or wholly dominated by the hitherto subordinate group. No study has ever actually been able to establish this popular theory in practice, or to identify this mythical point, but it has remained a popular political device.
As other social geographers have noted, it is equally possible to ‘mingle only in the market place’; and to be essentially in parallel universes for the rest of the time: a situation sometimes referred to as a ‘plural society’. Further, most statistical analyses have failed to take into account the diversity within (for example) the ‘south Asian’ population – as might be observed when examining the different distributions of members of religious or linguistic groups (Sims 1981: Robinson 1979). Phillips and others have also discussed the degree of flexibility or permeability between ‘ethnic identities’ and the way in which one aspect of an identity (say, language or nationality) might be given priority over another at different times, to identify with a most ‘prestigious’ group. Thus too, Leiberson proposed a kind of colour-coded scale within a hierarchical society or at least a queuing theory, whereby certain groups were deemed to be more socially ‘alike’ or acceptable, and move faster ‘up the scale’ or towards a form of social integration. Peach (1981), indeed, also argued for the abandonment of spatial units of analysis in favour of family-level data to examine the degree to which intermarriage marked the breakdown of barriers between groups: the ultimate in ‘community integration. Thus, while there was (and has continued to be) an interest in what simple statistical analysis of spatial patterns may tell us about relationships between social groups (Smith 1985) attention has turned more towards examination of the effects of segregation, such as the coincidence between areas of population concentration for specific groups with worst employment opportunity, welfare provision and physical environment or access to public services (Johnson 1985). That said, recent publications such as Bain’s report for the Greater London Authority have continued to explore the possibility of ‘defining’ or describing Diversity, using the Simpson Diversity Index, without yet establishing any relationship between this characteristic and the existence, prediction or association with other social issues (Bains 2005). This report has, in the same vein, largely tended to be driven by its informants and concentrate on the measurement of population diversity rather than explore the degree to which such measurement might be able to be used in the management of urban (or indeed rural) communities to avoid a breakdown of community cohesion, but at the same time we are conscious that such thoughts and perceptions lie behind the advice we were given.

More modern social theory and political discussion has tended to build on earlier debates about ‘race relations’ and migration, to consider issues of ‘community cohesion’, and the degree to which cultural or socio-economic diversity might threaten a working, collaborative society. McGhee (2003) discusses the complexity of the concept of community cohesion, of which there is no single agreed common definition. Nevertheless, there does seem to be some consensus that attachment to place, location, and interaction are crucial elements, including the sharing of (access to) facilities, living in ‘familiar’ areas, or areas where neighbours can be deemed to have common social interests (or solidarity) is also an important element in spatial choice, especially where this conduces to economic regeneration and increased relative prosperity or the reduction of socio-economic disadvantage. Again, there has been much attention to measures of community cohesion which seem to mirror those in earlier debates, and a focus on measuring the degree of that diversity. Worley (2005) describes ‘community cohesion’ as ‘the new framework governing race relations policy in the UK’. Worley suggests that this might be seen as a way of deracialising the debate, although it might also be an appropriate way to move forward, recognising the existence or emergence of new groups of migrant /minorities and new forms of social cleavage and differentiation – such as the increasing (but not entirely new: Johnson 1988) focus on religion and ‘faith groups’, or the description of white European minorities as the ‘new other’. Nevertheless, the concept and measurement of the geography of differing ‘communities’, their integration and spatial
location or clustering, remain central to these debates. Robinson observes that ‘great emphasis was placed on the contribution of residential segregation to social disharmony and unrest’ (in the Bradford, Burnley and Oldham disturbances of 2001: Robinson 2005 :1413) As Martin (2004) shows, interest in the composition of ‘neighbourhoods’ remains a key concern, driving the production of official statistics. The fear is that groups will increasingly self-segregate by ‘retreating into ‘comfort zones’ made up of people like themselves (Ouseley 2001). Even if this is untrue, it remains important to be able to measure spatial dispersal and concentration, even if only to be able to deny this is a factor, or to demonstrate that it is not happening. However, as a recent report from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister demonstrates, the level of physical ‘mixing’ of population groups remains the easiest way to provide an estimate of the level of social integration and community cohesion, stating that “There has been an improvement in social cohesion across the country. The vast majority of cities have become more integrated during the past decade…” (ODPM 2005).

There will continue to be debates around these issues, especially in the context of notions of ‘social capital’. A ‘cohesive community’ should presumably also have a high degree of bridging social capital across the different ‘communities’ within an area. These ideas have become increasingly influential in the segregation debate with the idea that minority groups might have a high degree of ‘bonding social capital’ (i.e. large number of community organisations and strong traditional social organisation in these communities) but weak ‘bridging’ social capital – explaining the advantage of segregation to a minority community but also highlighting their isolation from the rest of the community. The Home Office Citizenship Survey includes questions on social capital and community which might be considered useful to address this issue. Some ‘Citizens Panels’ might collect this information, but this will not be available in a consistent form. The most likely source of data would be the regular surveys local authorities are supposed to be undertaking using the questions the Home Office and ODPM have devised in their guidance to monitor trends in cohesion, with targets to increase cohesion. Some of these questions are required in the regular Best Value and neighbourhood satisfaction surveys but there is some variation in practice following a degree of resistance by certain localities.

While there is some evidence that a quantitative approach has merit, at the same time, social sciences have also grown to give more attention to anthropological approaches and qualitative analysis of the experiences of groups and, at the same time, discussion of power relationships and the politics of migration and mixing. Of course, the major drawback of (unstructured) qualitative approaches is that the information obtained is dependent on the efficacy of contact with the population – people well networked in community groups with which researchers have contact will be well-represented while the socially isolated will not have a voice. Marginal/transient people are also under-represented in such networks, although some local authorities have created ‘new communities forums’ to which any self-recognised community-based organisation can seek admittance. There is no way of knowing how representative this anthropological evidence is. Quantitative indicators based on measuring people’s actual behaviour should not be dismissed and ‘numbers’ remain important in public and political discourse. From the perspective of the urban manager or politician, an understanding of the best ways of measuring social change and the relationship between members of minority (ethnic) groups is essentially one of mathematical modelling. For this reason therefore, rather than continuing to debate the merits of different indexes or units of analysis, this discussion will focus on what data, measuring what, and at what levels, is currently or potentially available for this purpose.
Recording data on Ethnicity, ‘Race’ and Nationality etc

The issue of ‘ethnic monitoring’ has been extensively debated, and while the practice has been adopted and promoted in certain sectors, notably in health and social care, social housing provision, and to a lesser extent in education, remains controversial. UK law permits the recording of almost all types of information within the parameters of the Data Protection Act, while European regulation on data protection suggests that data on ethnicity should not be collected except for specified purposes – which do however include public protection, and health care (Johnson 1998). Some national legislatures explicitly prohibit the recording of ethnicity or even religious data, while in the UK the debate has more often focused on the utility and classification of such data, and advocated the recording of information on language, culture or religion and diet while retaining the use of ‘traditional’ measures such as country of birth and the Census ‘ethnic group’ questions (Johnson 2001). However, while the NHS and other bodies including the Housing Corporation have officially required regular reports on the breakdown of ‘service users’ by ethnic group, the quality of such data recording has been highly variable and frequently resisted, not least by the street-level bureaucrats responsible for its collection. Consequently, reports based on such data, usually using the standard Census (currently ‘16+1’) categories, frequently show significant numbers of cases reported as ‘not known’ or ‘did not answer question’, rendering them of less value. Recording of other dimensions of diversity, such as religion or preferred language, is also infrequent and often poorly conducted: Nationality data are very unusual, and the degree of confusion over terms such as ‘asylum seeker’ and refugee status means that no reliance can be placed on reports using such terms, which are almost never formally recorded except by official bodies (such as Home Office funded agencies) whose explicit function is to manage the needs of members of these groups.
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Welcome to CityStats

Brighton & Hove’s interactive data catalogue and mapping service is a partnership of public sector providers, committed to sharing data effectively and making statistical and service information more accessible.

Queries
The data and statistics catalogue lets you access a wide range of data. Data can be plotted or thematically mapped for different geographical areas.

Reports
A variety of data for common themes such as Housing or Transport are combined into reports. The reports are pre-generated and optimised for fast download.

Map Data
See the results of your queries mapped on a photographic aerial view of Ordnance Survey Map, or go directly to the Interactive Map.

Find my Nearest
Enter your postcode and find a service (such as a GP Surgery) closest to you. See the location of other similar services. Find my Nearest.

Feedback & Suggestions
Please fill in the Feedback Form to help us improve CityStats. If your organisation is a CityStats partner, you can register and log in to use more advanced features of the site.

CityStats is the place for wildlife in Brighton & Hove. Find out about the huge variety of plants, animals and special places for wildlife and how you can help conserve them...

Please Note
The citystats website has recently undergone extensive re-development. During the initial stages following this re-development we apologise for any difficulties you may experience. Please use the feedback form to inform us of any problems that arise.

Data and Statistics
Browse the folder tree to retrieve data based on specific themes. Some queries will prompt you for a date-range. For mapped data you will be able to specify the geographical area of interest.

CityStats is hosted by Brighton & Hove City Council King’s House, Grand Avenue Hove BN3 2SL Tel (01273) 290000